This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

FOR THE

MESSAGE OF THE NEW

AN EFFORT TO CONNECT MORE CLOSELY THE TESTAMENTS;
TO WHICH IS ADDED A SERIES OF PAPERS ON
VARIOUS OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS
AND SUBJECTS

BY

ANSON BARTIE CURTIS, B.D., PH.D.
INSTRUCTOR IN HEBREW IN TUFTS COLLEGE DIVINITY SCHOOL

BOSTON
UNIVERSALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE
30 WEST STREET

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY
UNIVERSALIST PUBLISHING HOUSE

TYPOGRAPHY BY C. J. PETERS & SON, BOSTON.

PRINTED BY F. H. GILSON CO.

BS
1171
.C87

TO

THE PARENTS OF MY WIFE,

AND TO

MY OWN FATHER AND MOTHER,

WHOSE UNTIRING TOILS WERE MY OPPORTUNITIES,

I Dedicate this Book

IN MEMORY OF PLEASANT SUMMERS IN MICHIGAN.

"For out of the old fieldes, as men saithe,
Cometh all this new corne fro to yere to yere.
And out of old bookes, in good faithe,
Cometh al this new science that men lere,
But now to purpose, as of this mattere,
To rede forth it gan me so delite,
That all the day me thought it but a lite."

CHAUCER.

PREFACE.

"THE obstinate insisting that tweedledum is *not* tweedledee is the bone and marrow of life. . . . The process of history consists in certain folks becoming possessed of the mania that certain special things are important infinitely, whilst other folks cannot agree in the belief." So Prof. W. James has written. And the statement may be taken as an apology for any lack of originality that may be discovered in these chapters. If they contain anything new, it is the emphasis. And the excuse for the book is the obvious fact that some things have to be said again and again, in various styles and with different spirit, before their full lesson is finally learned.

Some of the following chapters were originally published in religious papers and magazines, and others have been given as addresses; but one purpose runs through the whole, which is also still further illustrated by the rambles in Old Testament Books and Subjects with which the volume closes.

The method of study here adopted, it is hoped, will serve a double purpose. It brings to each Testament

the support of the other for all in it that is of positive and permanent value; and it helps to eliminate from each Testament its transient and temporal teachings by offering the other as its corrective and supplement. The New Testament religion is a reaction against a dogmatic apprehension of the Old. We ought not, therefore, to expect perfect completeness and poise in either Testament. This can only come from the union of the two. Each, in fact, corrects, supplements, and illustrates the other.

The reason the God of the Hebrews is in this work called Jahveh is the simple fact that Jehovah is not a word and means nothing. As a further help to the reader I may say that, in the references to the Bible, parts of verses are often indicated by the letters *a*, *b*, *c*, immediately following the verse figure. The letter *a* indicates the first part of the verse, *b* the second part, and so on.

My authorities have been, so far as practicable, indicated in the footnotes.

A. B. C.

TUFTS COLLEGE, MASS., Feb. 17, 1894.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

1. Our attitude towards the unsolved problems. 2. Our attitude towards the critics. 3. Three stages in the life of the Bible student: illustration. *Pages* 15–21

CHAP. I. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. "Back to the Past:" Paul the first to raise the cry. 2. The common method reversed. 3. The relations of the Testaments. 4. The enduring character of Old Testament religion. 5. A revival of Old Testament study is already at hand, but it is limited. 6. The Old Testament needs no defence. 7. The student should follow behind the critics. 8. The Old Testament religion rests upon a series of divine revelations. 9. The Old Testament a book of examples; the New of precepts . . . . . *Pages* 25–34

CHAP. II. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS OWN SAKE.

1. The religion of the civilized world is from the Jew. 2. What Israel did not do. 3. What Israel did do. The Bible deserves its place as a religious classic. 4. Ignorance of the Bible inexcusable. 5. Internal obstacles to Bible study. 6. External obstacles. 7. Historical obstacles. 8. These overcome. The value of technical Bible study. 9. Literary masterpieces in the Bible. 10. The greatness of the Bible. 11. The value of the Bible to the Christian believer . . . . . *Pages* 37–48

CHAP. III. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

1. A pair of pictures. 2. The doctrine of inspiration the result of the primitive socialism. 3. The teaching of the Old Testament concerning inspiration. 4. Growing accuracy in details as minds and morals develop. 5. The Old Testament writers do not claim infallibility: growth of ideas. 6. The New Testament supports the Old. 7. The evils of erroneous ideas of inspiration and revelation. 8. It is expedient that the old view be given up: new meanings for old words. 9. The proof of inspiration. 10. Influence of the doctrine of inspiration: it contains implicit the doctrine of the immanent God . . . . . *Pages* 51–57

CHAP. IV. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A VALID PROOF OF GOD'S EXISTENCE.

1. Relations of the proofs of God to God in history. 2. Apologetic value of the growing consciousness of God in the Old Testament, 3. Origin of the Jahveh cult. 4. Moses as leader and organizer of his people. 5. Moses as judge and prophet. 6. As lawgiver and religious teacher. 7. The theology of the Song of Deborah. 8. Jahveh at first a tribal or national God. 9. Jahveh and the calves of Bethel and Dan. 10. Jahveh as the God of righteousness. 11. Spiritual monotheism and practical atheism. 12. God a spirit, and man morally free. 13. Isaiah and "God in History." 14. Conclusion.

Pages 79–95

CHAP. V. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE MESSIAH.

1. Unnatural and natural Messianic prophecy. 2. The beginnings of the Messianic idea. 3. Jeremiah and Ezekiel. 4. Changes in the national hope. Isaiah and the exilian writers. 5. Haggai and Zechariah: Malachi and Joel. 6. Daniel and the Apocrypha. 7. The Messiah a priest. 8. The Messiah a prophet. 9. Revival of the kingly Messiah of the early prophets. 10. The number of Messianic passages increased by scribal exegesis. 11. The combining of various ideas. 12. The Messiah a prophet and teacher, not an atoning sacrifice. 13. The New Testament fulfilment . . . *Pages* 99–122

CHAP. VI. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE WAY OF SALVATION.

I. EARLY IDEAS OF SACRIFICE.

1. Does the O. T. doctrine of sacrifice look forward to Christ? 2. Early sacrifices. 3. The Passover. 4. The sacrifice a feast. 5. Self-mutilation not atonement. 6. The sacrifice a gift to the gods. 7. The expiatory offering. 8. The ransom . . . . . *Pages* 125–129

II. EARLY REACTIONS.

9. The prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, decry the popular views of sacrifice. 10. Prophetic scheme of forgiveness and reconciliation. 11. The reaction of the sages. 12. The reaction of the poets. 13. The Buddha's idea of sacrifice . . . . . *Pages* 130–136

III. THE PRIESTLY COUNTER REFORMATION.

14. The priest-prophets. 15. The Levitical doctrine of the sacrifice. 16. The sin of ignorance and its consequences. 17. The scapegoat and day of atonement . . . . . *Pages* 136–141

IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

18. Paul's doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ. 19. The death of Christ abrogated, not fulfilled, the law. 20. Looseness in the N. T. ideas of Jesus' sacrificial death. 21. Paul's view really a return to prophetism. 22. Support of this view in early Christian literature. 23. Ballou its first advocate in this country . . . . . *Pages* 142–150

CHAP. VII. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE SUFFERING CHRIST.

I. THE SOCIAL VIEW OF ATONEMENT ACCORDING TO SECOND ISAIAH.

1. Human sacrifice in early Israel. 2. The atoning powers of the righteous. 3. The mission of the righteous servant in Isaiah liii. 4. The servant as the nation or righteous portion of the nation. 5. The servant a guilt-offering for the world. 6. The ideas of "law" and of "sacrifice" spiritualized. 7. The servant's preparation for his work. 8. Second Isaiah's view of the unity of the race: a social view of atonement. . . . . *Pages* 153–167

II. SECOND ISAIAH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

9. The ideas of Messiah and suffering righteous are kept distinct: Jewish developments of the thought of Isaiah liii. 10. Ideas which tended towards a Messianic interpretation of the same. 11. The quotations from Isaiah liii. in the New Testament, as a rule, disappointing. 12. Jesus' own view of his sufferings and death. 13. New Testament passages that clearly teach the social view of atonement . . . . . *Pages* 168–181

III. APPENDIX ON SECOND ISAIAH.

1. The theory of the three Babylonian Isaiahs. 2. Chapter lii. 13 to liii. 12 a dialogue, notes on the section. 3. Isaiah liii. in the Targums. *Pages* 181–184

CHAP. VIII. BACK TO BOTH TESTAMENTS FOR THEIR RECONCILIATION.

1. The Christ as Messiah, as sacrifice, and as suffering servant. 2. Was Jesus the Christ? 3. Different views of the relation of prophecy and fulfilment. 4. Prophecy must be studied in the light of its own age. 5. Significance of Jesus' adoption of the Jewish Messianic idea. 7. Jesus the true Messiah in the light of Jeremiah's promised "new covenant." 8. The reconciliation: true religion is found in either Testament . . . *Pages* 187–195

CHAP. IX. BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS SOCIOLOGY.

1. The broader modern view of society. 2. Sociology defined. 3. The Scriptures have been too exclusively studied on the side of their theology. 4. Sociological value of the Hebrew history. 5. Chronologically arranged the Bible is the best text-book on sociology. 6. An outline of Biblical sociology. 7. The family. 8. The nation. 9. Land. 10. Labor. 11. Rich and poor. 12. Education. 13. Religion: Biblical sociology is sociology with a soul . . . . . *Pages* 199–213

CHAP. X. SOME ANCIENT AND MODERN ESTIMATES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. 2. The Old Testament in the New. 3. The Old Testament in the early Church. 4. Estimates from classifications. 5. The German Idealists, Kant, Hegel, Schelling, and Lotze. 6. Newman Smyth and Professor Ely: Haeckel and the scientists: Dillman. 7. The need of adapting our view of the Bible to the facts. 8. The Biblical authors were religious, not scientific, specialists . . . . . *Pages* 217–229

CHAP. XI. EVOLUTION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Difficulties in the way of a definition of evolution. 2. Twofold meaning of the word "origin." 3. Evolution the manifestation of a consciousness eternally the same. 4. Lessing and the education of the human race. 5. Why not accept evolution as a method? 6. Difficulties. 7. Robertson Smith and the evolution of Old Testament religion. 8. Edward Caird and the evolution of the absolute religion . . . . . *Pages* 233–247

CHAP. XII. LEISURELY RAMBLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SOME OF ITS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS.

I. PROFESSOR RYLE AND THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

1. Mr. Ryle's point of view. 2. Significance of the threefold division. 3. The formation of the canon a slow process. 4. The first canon completed by Ezra. 5. The second canon two hundred years later. 6. The third canon still open in the time of Christ . . . . . *Pages* 251–258

II. THE LIBERAL PREACHER AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

1. Mistaken views. 2. Higher criticism defined. 3. Progress in mechanics and theology compared. 4. Heber Newton and Newman Smyth. 5. Criticism is not rationalism . . . . . *Pages* 258–264

III. PROFESSOR TOY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

1. The uselessness of much of the older literature. 2. Professor Toy's religion of Israel. 3. The need of a bird's-eye view at the outset, *Pages* 264–266

IV. W. ROBERTSON SMITH AND THE JEWISH BIBLE.

1. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. 2. Need of more scientific methods of Biblical study. 3. Textual errors. 4. Material at hand for textual criticism. 5. Early Hebrew written without vowels: Jahveh. 6. Hebrew history reconstructed . . . . . *Pages* 266–271

V. PROFESSOR DRIVER AND OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

1. The work itself. 2. The Book of Judges. 3. The Book of Deuteronomy. 4. Isaiah. 5. Isaiah xiii., xiv. 6. Isaiah xv., xvi. 7. Isaiah xxiv–xxvii. 8. The effect of Driver's book as a whole . . . . *Pages* 271–277

VI. THE MEN OF THE BIBLE.

1. History from biography. 2. Jeremiah and Moses. 3. The biographical sermon . . . . . *Pages* 277–280

VII. PROFESSOR GENUNG AND THE BOOK OF JOB.

1. The problem of the book. 2. The author's aim not to prove, but to show. 3. Job, not the Book of Job, solves the problem. 4. The date and integrity of the book. 5. The character of the composition. 6. Genung's translation . . . . . *Pages* 281–286

VIII. RENAN: HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK.

1. A sketch of the life of Renan. 2. The character of his work. 3. Read Renan! . . . . . *Pages* 286–292

IX. PROFESSOR TOY'S JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

1. Professor Toy's position. 2. The theology of the Jews. 3. Sociology and religion. 4. The significance for religion of the great man. 5. Particular and universal religions. 6. Professor Toy's method comprehensive. *Pages* 292–298

X. CANON CHEYNE AND DEVOUT CRITICISM.

1. The higher critic as a preacher of the gospel. 2. David in history and in tradition. 3. The Psalms do not lose in fervor by being placed after the exile . . . . . *Pages* 298–302

XI. PROFESSOR DRIVER AS A PREACHER.

1. Misapprehension of the methods of Driver and others. 2. The helpfulness and reasonableness of "Sermons on the Old Testament." 3. Permanent elements in the Old Testament . . . . . *Pages* 302–306

CHAP. XIII. HINTS FOR THE PULPIT AND DEVOTIONAL USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. The great preachers have been Old Testament students. 2. The need of a book of wise selections from the Old Testament: an expurgated Bible. 3. That the Church has a right to make such a book of selections appears from the history of the formation of the canon. 4. A list of readings suggested for pulpit or devotional use . . . . . *Pages* 309–314

CHAP. XIV. AN INEXPENSIVE OLD TESTAMENT LIBRARY.

1. Commentaries in general. 2. A list of the best English commentaries on the Old Testament. 3. Introductions to the Old Testament. 4. Theologies. 5. Histories. 6. Expositions, running commentaries. 7. The late books and the inscriptions . . . . . *Pages* 317–322

INTRODUCTION.

"How truly its central position is impregnable, religion has never adequately realized."

HERBERT SPENCER.

"It is by no means impossible that the world, tired out by the constant bankruptcy of liberalism, will once more become Jewish and Christian."

ERNEST RENAN.

INTRODUCTION.

1. THIS is an age in which we are encountering myriads of unsolved and perhaps insoluble questions. Some of these questions are vital and practical, others are ideal and theoretical. All alike are important. And so far as we can it is our duty to solve them.

But when we have done our best, there will still remain a large field of truth touching the very foundations of the intellectual, moral, and religious life that cannot be wholly explored. There will always be unsolved problems, there will always be unproven truths. What shall be our attitude towards these? Shall we treat them indifferently because they are unproved? Shall we turn agnostic, and exalt our ignorance into a philosophy? Shall we go to the other extreme, attempt the impossible, and labor to prove what God never intended should be proven by human reason? Evidently none of these questions implies the correct answer. The rather do we turn to the lines of Tennyson, which John F. Genung has recently emphasized, —

> "For nothing worthy proving can be proven
> Nor yet disproven; wherefore, then, be wise,
> Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt,
> And cling to faith beyond the forms of faith."

"This ever-present faith in faith," says Professor

Genung, "gives a marvellous uplift to all Tennyson's poetic work." It will give a marvellous uplift to the work of any man, no matter what his calling. It is faith, rather than the forms of faith, that is the important thing.

What is this sunnier side of doubt in regard to Old Testament questions? In the first place, the sunny side of doubt is never found in those who cling to old exploded notions. By this means a man may make himself the contemporary of his great-grandfathers, but he can never thus become the teacher of his grandchildren. No, the sunnier side of doubt consists in searching out and emphasizing the old faith that lies hid in the new truths. For the race has hold of something real and eternal in its religious faith. That was a profound remark of Kant's in which he proclaimed that it is only the permanent that can suffer change. The fact, then, that religious faith can and does adapt itself to new conditions is a sign of its permanence. The sunnier side of doubt, therefore, is never timid, never rash, never sentimental, but full of love for the truth, and faith in the truth.

2. The discussion presupposes throughout the general correctness of the views of Driver, Cheyne, Briggs, Robertson, Smith, and others. But at the same time our effort is not to establish those results, but to show in some detail how the Christian religion has gained in authority, in attractiveness, and in spirituality by an appeal to the New Bible. I have not added to the Decalogue, as a learned translator of Sophocles has recently suggested, this new commandment, "Thou shall not covet the German's knife, nor his readings, nor

his meters, nor his sense, nor his taste, nor anything that is his." But I have felt free to accept suggestions from the Germans, or from any other scholars, when they appealed to reason and common-sense.

A word of warning may not be out of place for some readers. We remember the story of those who cast out devils but "walked not with us." And we remember also the advice of Gamaliel regarding the treatment of those not in perfect accord with the religious notions of the ruling authorities. History points us many lessons, and none with more emphasis than this, that it is the easiest thing in the world to mistake the supports upon which our religion stands. This is apparently a part of our common human nature. She who suffers a great sorrow is sure, while the bitterness of her grief is upon her, that she can never be happy again; yet time revives the springs of joy. He who suffers a great defeat is sure, in the moment of his chagrin, that he can never again lift up his head; yet rest brings purpose and assurance once more to his relief. So when Jesus began to preach, the honest Jews said he violated the law and robbed religion of its authority. But Jesus' teachings have prevailed, and religion glows with more fervor than ever before. When it was found that the earth is really round, and revolves about the sun, the church said the Bible is in peril, and it threw itself in the face of the telescope and the geometer. Science prevailed, and a larger world was given to the God of the Bible, and a more intelligent church. There was quaking at the discovery of the sun spots, the circulation of the blood, the medical art, at the marvellous advances of geology, biology, and the recent evolutionary science.

Yet, amidst all these, religion holds its own, and its central position becomes ever more impregnable. Let us be very careful, then, what we say about the modern critics, lest we be found fighting against God. Modern methods of reconstructing the Old Testament history and religion are, it is admitted, a kind of reasoning in a circle. And there are many lacunæ in the circumference. Yet I believe that the circle is one beyond which no facts lie that possess the power to do other than make the circumference more regular and more complete, and its centre, which is the divine love, more resplendent and more life-giving.

3. The Bible student who goes on unto perfection is very liable to have to pass through three well marked stages. These may be well illustrated by an instance given, I think, by J. Clark Murray in his Psychology.

It is related of a certain man born blind, whose sight had been restored, that a picture was shown to him, and he was asked to tell what he saw. He said he saw an object of divers colors, some bright, others dull, arranged in heterogeneous order upon the canvas. That is all the picture meant to him. He looked at it as all upon one surface without perspective. Then he was asked, "Do you not see a house, and behind it a barn, and farther back still a forest? Do you not see men and horses and boys in the yard, and various objects in and about the fields?" He looked again carefully. Yes, he saw it all now, and put forth his hand to thrust it into the picture, and touch the forest and barn. He thought it all real now. The barn he supposed did stand several inches behind a miniature house built four square. But the touch soon disclosed to him his error.

He was surprised a second time, for he found all these objects on the same surface. Now for the first time our man born blind is ready to begin a study of the picture.

So it is with the Bible reader.

At first every statement is on a level with every other; the history and the human nature lie hid; it is just a conglomeration of isolated statements, whose loneliness is rendered all the more oppressive by the ordinary division of the Bible into chapters and verses, which often inserts a dead stop in the very middle of a paragraph, or divides into different verses what only a comma should separate. The occasional reader of the Bible, unless his eyes have been opened by sermons and lectures and criticisms, can get no more out of the Bible than the restored blind man got out of his picture.

There are bright colors, but there is no idea at all of the meaning of the whole. All is seen, yet nothing is seen, because nothing is seen in its true relations. It may even be supposed that the dull colors are put about the bright colors to enhance their brilliancy. To the minister who is in this condition the Bible is a book of texts, and these are purposely hid amidst what is uninteresting to discourage habits of idleness.

The second stage in the process is also clearly marked. Things begin to appear in their relations. It is seen that history, prophecy, and poetry somehow imply each other. But still the idea of perspective has not been grasped. Now all is real. If the statement is made that the mountains clap their hands, they must

really have hands to clap. The stories of Abraham, of David, and of Elijah, are not of any value at all unless they are real. The Pentateuch is valueless and worse, if Moses did not write it. Such a student sees nothing unless he is permitted to believe that he is dealing with the veritable revelation of God and not its history. If he has not the thing, he will not admit that he has its lesson. He even reduces the whole to an absurdity if his way is not the right one. The house is, as he supposed at first, but a daub of colors, if it is not built four square.

But at last something happens, and our Bible student puts forth his hand to *touch* the story of Abraham or of Daniel. He reads a little profane history. He delves into the mysteries of the Hebrew lexicon and grammar. He learns the story of the foundation of the Old Testament canon. He is getting the idea of historical perspective. He touches the "morals of David." They are beautiful in their place in the picture. Out of their connection they are cruel and bloody and harsh. He touches the *motive* that gave the later portions of the Pentateuch to Moses. There was a consciousness of the real facts and yet no consciousness of wrong. For would not Moses in the later age have approved what they approved? So at last our Bible student comes to a correct view of things. But alas, hosts of us have never *touched* the Bible. And we have not learned how to appreciate the divine masterpiece. This is not wholly our fault. There has been a widely prevalent notion that the Bible must not be studied as are other books, and that its lessons must somehow be kept apart from our unholy secular life. What we need to do is to

touch the Bible with our every-day experience, look at it in the light of the common places as well as of the uncommon places of our existence. And it is evident also that we must make free and large use of the helps placed in our hands by recent discoveries.

CHAPTER I.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"With the righteousness of the prophets, from Amos to Jeremiah, Christianity might at once have joined hands."

HERMANN S. SCHULTZ.

"The blood is said to be the life; it is therefore the spirit or life of the law which does away sin. . . . The gospel is nothing but the spirit of the law, which is the word, or logos, spoken in the law, brought forth from the shadows of the old dispensation."

HOSEA BALLOU.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. OURS is an age in which the cry is, more or less, "Back to the Past!" In philosophy the cry some years ago was heard everywhere, "Back to Kant!" And this was met by the counter-cry, "Back to his Interpreters!" In theology we hear the cry, "Back to Luther and the Reformation!" And we hear alongside it, "and this means 'Back to Christ and the Apostles!'"

In Christian history, so far as I know, Paul first raised this cry. He saw in Christianity the overthrow of Judaism, and the revival of Old Testament Prophetism. And so he raised the cry among his Christian brethren, "Back to Abraham and the Prophets!" We have Paul's word for it that Christianity was a return to the ideals of the classic period of Hebrew religion. The law, he argued, came in as a side issue, necessary because of man's weakness, but interrupting the direct line of development which in Christ is restored and given by unmistakable proofs the fulness of the divine approval.

Now, if Paul thus goes back to the prophetic portions of the Old Testament for his starting-point, and other

New Testament writers just as obviously take their start from the legal side of the Jewish Scriptures, we ought frankly to admit that the new religion may here and there have limitations which are due entirely to the limitations of the past, out of which it came. And to recognize this is to free ourselves from the bondage of dogmas that are no longer helpful to our religious development. We can say, with truth, that Christianity took these as a part of its inheritance from Judaism, but that they are no more a part of Christianity than are tunics, girdles, and sandals. These were worn by the early Christians, not as a part of their religion, but because they were in style.

Not only does a return to the Old Testament reveal to us with trenchant force the temporal character of certain doctrines and customs that the Church has burdened itself with in the past, but it also shows that many misinterpretations of the Old Testament have been handed over to the New Testament to vitiate also its message. The fundamental New Testament doctrines, in fact, have been very largely corrupted by a misunderstanding of the real nature of the Old Testament and its relation to the New.

2. The fact is, the common method must be reversed. We have been wont to interpret the Old Testament in the light of the New. We have seen in it nothing but Christian doctrine. What we need to do now is to go to the Old Testament not only for illustrations of the New, but for a more full and complete understanding of its essential doctrines. Out of the modern movement, which has restored the Old Testament to us, will come, I doubt not, a new point

of view, which will restore the New Testament to us with a fulness and completeness of meaning that it never before had. Back to the Old Testament as a book of history, of ethics, of religion, and of sociology! This is our message and our "hobby." The preaching of the Old Testament to our own age is truly great. And this is due not alone to the fact that it is an able defender raised up out of the past for the doctrines of the Christ. It is this, but it is more: it is also their divinely called Creator and Teacher.

The thesis suggested by our title is one which cannot, in any adequate way, be treated in a small volume. It will be best, therefore, to eliminate as far as possible all side issues, and confine ourselves to a few New Testament doctrines which are fundamental, and which at the same time have their roots and their high-water mark of meaning in the Old Testament.

3. Some, of course, may incline to doubt whether any important New Testament doctrine is taught with equal insight in the Old. Indeed, there may be some of us who, like Schleiermacher, have been wont to deny that there is any vital and organic connection between the Testaments. It may be that we have been able to see only an accidental and external relationship, due to the fortuitous course of the history. Or it may be that, with Kant, we have denied to Judaism, as it existed in the days of Christ, the name of a religion, and have seen in it only a hodge-podge of senseless ritual, to which has been added, as the only redeeming feature, a code of purely statutory laws.

That such a view is arbitrary and unphilosophical is evident from a multitude of considerations. As Prof.

Edward Caird correctly maintains, all new movements have their roots in the past, and a new movement which denies every thesis of its predecessor is dependent upon its predecessor for the number and form of its denials. It may use all the rhetoric, all the logic, all the passionate and holy denunciation of its rival, by simply going through and inserting the negatives. But the dependence is more far-reaching than even this. Extremes meet. In the higher mathematics a positive infinity passes at a single bound to a negative infinity. A number increasing by minute additions from one to infinity, by the same minute addition passes from infinity-affirmative to infinity-negative. Anything carried to its limit is at the nearest possible point to its opposite. It is even as we so often say, "Extremes meet." Brahminism must produce Buddhism by inevitable decree. And the relation between them is a vital one. Jewish legalism carried to its logical conclusion is Paulinism. And a part of the conclusion in each case is the glorification of the person who stands as the type of the new law written on the heart; the persons, I say, of the Buddha and of the Christ.

4. But not only is Judaism a preparation for Christianity, a stage in the development of the most perfect and complete religion, but it has also certain permanent elements that can never be superseded. In certain lines Hebrew religion reached to well-nigh the summit of human aspiration. Newman Smyth, in his "Christian Ethics," regards Judaism as the second greatest religion of the world. And if we take it in its logical development up to the present time, who can deny that this is so? In the same vein Schultz says, "Christ and his

apostles do not regard the Old Testament religion as a mere outward historical preparation for Christianity, but as a form of piety which could and would continue to be the foundation even of Christian piety." In this opinion he is correct, but he follows this with a remark that ought not to be accepted without limitations. He says, "The Old Testament religion can be understood only in connection with, and as an essential part of, Christianity."[1] This has been the bugbear of Old Testament scholarship. It has been said that the real meaning of a prophecy or a doctrine hung fire until its New Testament fulfilment. And that the real meaning of an Old Testament writer is in every case to be determined by an appeal to its analogue in the New Testament. I affirm that just the reverse is true. The meaning of a New Testament writer is to be determined by an appeal to the religious notions upon which he was working, and which gave the form, and to a greater or less degree the content, of his thought. It is not true that the Old Testament must be understood in the light of the New with half the emphasis that it is true that the New must be understood in the light of the Old. The very existence of modern Judaism, and its rank among the religions of the world, shall be my evidence for this statement until I have furnished other and better proof.

5. Not only have many things happened in recent years to suggest our theme, but much has come to pass that has seemed to prove its fundamental thesis. There has been a marvellous revival of Old Testament study

[1] O. T. Theol. i. 51, 52; with which Smend also seems to agree [A. T. Rel.]; each $6.00. Geschichte, P. 6, ff.

within the last few years. Much has been done in churches, schools, and colleges to create a more cheerful and sympathetic study of the Old Testament. There was need enough of the enthusiasm that has been expended, and fortunately we are already reaping the harvest. Yet much remains to be desired. There are many superficial judgments passed upon the Jewish Scriptures that are unworthy the men that express them. They show an utter misapprehension of God's plans in the history and education of the race. Nor are these judgments the sole possession of the sidewalk philosophy. Not by any means! They come from the Christian home, and even from the pulpit. But so intimate is the connection between the Testaments that the Church can scarcely hope to find the world reverencing the New when the churchman pronounces hesitatingly on the Old. When the Church says, "We do not know about the Old Testament; it seems to be pretty well upset by recent criticisms," it must not surprise us if the world begins to say the same of the New. It is a mistake to ignore Old Testament questions, and think thereby to gain time and energy for the defence of the Christian revelation. I know there are many who think that it would be a gain to Christianity if it could give up the Old Testament. They say it has proved vulnerable in so many places that it costs more to defend it than it is worth.

6. But all this proceeds upon erroneous ideas. The Old Testament needs no defence. What it craves from the hands and hearts of its friends is an opportunity to be known in its true nature, and viewed in the light of its aims and its times. The treatment

which the Old Testament receives from many Christians is neither honest nor wise. Had Christianity sprung up as a new and independent growth, we might allow those who desire to do so to degrade the Old Testament to a level with the scriptures of the ethnic religions; but that independence, however rashly assumed and passionately defended, does not exist. Old and New Testaments are parts of one grand whole. And for this reason an interest in the Old Testament must be revived. An enthusiasm to learn what it can teach us better than any other book must be aroused, or Christianity has rashly thrown itself in the path of its destroyer. No institution can be half understood when studied merely as a segment of history. As the Old is imperfect without the New, so the New is an enigma without the thought-form and moral heritage of the Old.

7. He who would search for the beauties of the Hebrew religion must not ignore the critics, but neither must he feed upon them alone. He must be content to follow behind them. They may be radical and destructive; he must be conservative and constructive. It were better to hold to the old views of the Old Testament than to have absorbed only the negative and baldly intellectual side of the newer movement. Indeed, it is a question whether the cause of true religion is not injured more by those who swallow the higher criticism without digesting it, than by those who continue to plod along in the old exegesis, but yet see in the Hebrew Scriptures their rich vein of spiritual meaning. Many a man whose principles of criticism are right fails to apprehend the first A B C of the reli-

gious consciousness of the Jews; while many others who do not know the first word about the methods and aims of the critics, yet commune with God face to face through the medium of an Old Testament story or song or sermon.

Let the old tradition stand until it is overthrown by the manifest facts of science. On the other hand, so far as the positions of the old views were assumed, let them be held lightly, as all assumptions should be. When, however, the tradition is based upon fact, let it be defended with all the logic and learning possible. For when the sifting shall all have been done, enough of fact will surely remain to warrant us in affirming that the Old Testament had its origin in a series of divine revelations. Had not God revealed himself in a unique manner through towering personalities we are assured that we should have had no Bible. It is not out of existing institutions alone that society grows. It is in the hidden and innermost depths of inspired souls that "human society has its secret and mysterious roots" (Wellhausen).

8. When we have decided to place the Old Testament upon a series of revelations, we have made ourselves a laughing-stock to the age unless we define our position more in detail. "Any one," it may be said, "can reveal as much of moral and religious truth as Amos or Hosea or Habakkuk." This kind of criticism, and it is all too prevalent, wholly ignores historical perspective, and is alien to the scientific spirit. The question is not whether a Christian citizen, in whose veins are the habits and aspirations of nineteen Christian centuries, could surpass Amos. But the question is whether

an Aztec or a Zulu can equal him or even approach his grandeur of soul. Nay, the question is not whether an Aztec could equal Amos, but whether an Aztec race could follow an Amos with an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, and an Ezekiel, a John Baptist, a Jesus, and a Paul. The question involves all this.

9. I raise, finally, the cry of back to the Old Testament, because it teaches by example the lessons which the New so often only gives in precept.

A reason why we should regard the Old Testament as a part of the Christian Bible is the fact, widely recognized, that the Old Testament is one of the richest books in all literature, in its broad, honest, and sympathetic views of human nature. The New Testament is weak upon the human side. It is replete with dogma, but deficient in character painting. It is sketchy. Two lives only are traced for us in detail, and these but for short periods. Character does not develop before our very eyes. The New Testament glistens with inspirations, with insights into the divine. It abounds in pictures, carefully drawn of men caught in the sublimest attitudes of which a human soul is capable. I speak of the rash self-assertion of Peter's denial, of Stephen's martyrdom, of Paul's conversion, his trial before Agrippa, his parting with the elders of Ephesus. But the Old Testament is richer and more full on this same human side. To speak of the whole Bible as an epic, we may call the Old the setting which gives the New its interest and its meaning. Here love-song and story, poetry and poetic prose, history and annals, worldly wisdom and religious fervor, the pessimistic wail of the sensualist and the buoyant

laughter of shepherd and shepherdess, all commingle. We are kept in intimate relations with great characters for long intervals. We trace the growth of mind, and the development of soul. We learn all one's foibles. We come to see in what his strength consists. We are not limited to the one man, however, or to his age. We can study man in his relations. The development of national character, as well as of individual character, is portrayed. We can trace the growth of the idea of God, of sin, and of salvation, from rude beginnings to enviable perfections. Reforms go on gathering momentum as time multiplies in years, with here and there a backsliding whose causes may or may not appear. We can watch the effect upon the national and individual life of manly wrestlings with the knottiest problems of all time. In one age, it is between a spiritual and a sensuous deity; in another, it is the question of heredity and individual responsibility; in still another, it is between virtue and happiness, as always united or as united only sometimes and in some lives. Then there is that internecine struggle with practical atheism and moral indifference, voiced in so many of the Psalms. In all of these, the highest genius of Israel was victorious, and the power of God as a Saviour of his people was vindicated.

Is it necessary to say more in this direction in order to convince one of the grandeur of the Old Testament revelation?

CHAPTER II.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS OWN SAKE.

" The Old Testament possesses distinctive characteristics of its own, which must ever secure for it a permanent position and influence in the Church."

" Truthfulness, honesty, sincerity, justice, humanity, philanthropy, generosity, disinterestedness, neighborly regard, sympathy with the unfortunate or the oppressed, the refusal to injure another by word or deed, cleanness of hands, purity of thought and action, elevation of motive, singleness of purpose,— these and such as these . . . are the virtues which, again and again, in eloquent and burning words, are commended and inculcated in the pages of the Old Testament."

S. R. DRIVER.

CHAPTER II.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS OWN SAKE.

1. No subject of study can be more interesting and profitable, considered even from a secular point of view, than the history of the Hebrew people from the earliest times to the close of the first Christian century. The history of Israel has taught the world, inspired the world, moralized the world, as has no other history under heaven. To Judaism and Christianity the civilized world goes for its religion and its ethical ideal. It is here that we meet with the greatest statesmen, the purest preachers, and the noblest lives. It is here that we meet not only men who lived nobly, but men who refuse to be satisfied till their brothers and sisters also live nobly with them. It is in Hebrew history that to a marked degree we find God in history. Hebrew history is the story of human progress under the guidance of the Spirit of God. And the Bible is written with this end in view. It shows that God is the teacher of the race.

The Jews were indeed a peculiar people. And at the first sight, as we glance over an outline of their civil and political progress, we are almost forced to the conclusion that a nation so peculiar, so small, and so insular in its habits, can by no possibility have greatly

influenced the course of the world's history in succeeding ages. Yet the very exclusiveness and littleness of Israel fitted it in a special way to become the teacher of the world for all time. Israel does not teach us many lessons, but it teaches one lesson well. And we need not be long in deciding what that lesson is.

2. Let us note briefly some of the things that Israel did not do. It did not produce a great world conqueror. There were times when the Hebrews were ambitious to rule. The empire of David was not inconsiderable, and three hundred years later Jeroboam II. enlarged the borders of the nation, and forced the surrounding nations to submit to his rule. But at no time was this extended sway enduring. Indeed, it was always dependent upon the misfortunes of the great Semitic empires in the heart of Asia; and when, finally, shortly after the death of Jeroboam II., the arms of Assyria began to be successful, Israel lost its political independence, never again to regain it for any considerable time.

Neither did the Hebrew people produce a philosophy. There is some dealing with abstractions in the Book of Job. There is some theorizing in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. But no system of philosophy appears like that of Greece. Even the God of the Hebrews is accepted as a matter of course. He is named, but not defined. His attributes are nowhere catalogued. The intellectual process whereby we conceive him is nowhere outlined.

The Jews have left us no works of art. Some of the utensils used in the temple service were artistically designed; but they were of foreign models, as was also the

temple of Solomon itself. There was no sculpture, no painting. The teraphim, or household images, were perhaps busts of deceased ancestors. But they were rudely carved, and do not deserve to be classed as works of art. Something was done by the Jews in music, but what and how much is unknown. The musical terms which occur in the Book of Psalms are untranslatable.

Neither were the Jews lovers and careful students of nature for its own sake. There is a late tradition that Solomon was a botanist; but it is of little value. While the poets and prophets display a considerable knowledge of their native surroundings, they have left us nothing that may be claimed as in the faintest degree suggestive to the student of natural science. So, then, we must search farther if we would find the true value of Hebrew history.

3. We need not read a whole book of the Bible, indeed a chapter is sufficient, to convince us that to the Jew everything is subordinate to religion. What patriotism, philosophy, science, and art are to the nations, religion is to the Jew. Jahveh is the nation's God and king. For him they will live or die. The fear of him is the beginning of wisdom. To know him is the highest philosophy. His holiness is the most perfect beauty. His will is the highest good.

The Hebrews were adepts in religious literary art. But they have not even here a wide range; they must make up in intensity where they are deficient in breadth. The writings of their prophets are unique. Prophecy is the creation of the Hebrew spirit; no other literature has anything like it, or nearly like it. And

it is this very part of the Hebrews' contribution to modern culture that has been the chief inspiration of all the world's greatest and best loved reformers. The Bible, then, is the world's greatest text-book on religion. The civilized nations are Jewish and Christian in their religion.

A large body of men and women in these civilized lands continue, like the ancient Hebrews, to subordinate all else to their religion. Their religion is their philosophy. It is their science, their poetry, and their music. Draw them in conversation away from their religion, and they are lost. Ask them a question upon which they cannot bring their religion to bear, and they have no answer. We, as minister, lawyer, doctor, or man of the world, are going to meet these and similar people. Some of these we will desire for friends. It behoves us then as a matter of general information, if for no other reason, to acquaint ourselves with the book which is the religious teacher of the masses.

But we have by no means said all when we have said thus much. The Bible is not the book it is by chance. The world did not choose it by lot. The Bible is the text-book on religion of the civilized world because it deserves to be. The religion of the Bible is so strong on the practical and moral side, that even he who half disbelieves in religion may study the Bible, when he has been shown the way, with a real zest.

There is no greater moral and practical civilizing force in the world to-day than the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. This fact is very widely admitted. This being so, it follows, as a matter of course, that a knowl-

edge of the nature and contents of these Scriptures will greatly augment a man's influence, whatever be his vocation. A knowledge of Biblical ideas and ideals will at once put a man in touch with the general line of advance. Along with progress in medicine and law and mechanics goes progress in religion, and *vice-versa.* The Bible is a book that has ever been interpreted as on the side of advance. The Bible is a book which illustrates the law of evolution as does no other. The doctrine of the atonement has shifted as often as our ideas of criminal law have been amended. So everywhere, a few years ago, the Bible was made to favor individualism: modern books bristle with quotations placing the emphasis on the side of solidarity: on the practical side the Bible is the most complex and versatile book in our libraries. Not an age since the Christ but has ignored some part of it. In other words, no age has quite succeeded in living up to the good, and casting away that which is effete. When we study the individual Christian life we find the same to be true. No one lives a life quite so rich and complex as the perfect life outlined by the Bible.

4. In view of these facts, it is to be deplored that the people of the Christian world are ignorant of the Bible. We owe it to the Bible that we are what we are. It is the Bible history that we are completing and carrying on to its glad consummation. Some may have come to think that there is no Bible history. That criticism has destroyed the belief in the historical veracity of the Old and even of the New Testament. This is not so. The highest proof of the divinity of the Christian religion lies in church history, and more

especially in the life of the Church to-day. So the religion of the Old Testament is an historical religion. It was developed in connection with the Hebrew history. It finds its proof and its divinity in the fact that it produced and directed that history, and thus produced the mother soil out of which Christianity grew.[1] If, then, it is the Bible history that we are completing, shall we not fail or work amiss if we ignore our guide? Still, there is a bright side. The Bible is more widely read and better understood than ever before. The number of those who can appreciate and enjoy its ethics and religion is multiplying rapidly. Colleges are taking up the Bible as a text-book, and supplementing the work of the home, the church, and the Sunday-school. It is also to be expected that the masses will remain ignorant of certain parts of the Scriptures for some time to come. The Bible is a library, and most of us have our favorite authors there. Jehu, Ahab, Jeremiah, and Haggai are but names to multitudes who love Job, while a man of considerable intelligence might read the Book of Job, and entirely miss its underlying thought. Job is the work of a master hand, and great works necessarily address themselves to the few. The great thoughts of the world are a rich mine yet to be discovered and utilized by the masses. But the progress of the world depends upon this very discovery. It therefore becomes the duty of those who can, to assist their brothers in the search after the true gospel of the world's great prophets.

5. The Bible teacher need not be discouraged by the fact that his text-book contains chapters that are not

[1] Smend's Alttestamentliche Religions-Geschichte, S, 6.

only little read, but less understood. All noble literatures contain books that speak to the few. Virgil and Homer, Dante and Shakespeare, are mere names to people who ought to know them by heart. It cannot, then, be a misplaced enthusiasm which urges that the Bible, as well as the other classics, be read more and more carefully. These are the books that ought to profoundly influence the world, rather than those built upon the shifting sands of the present. These good old books have momentum. They are the world's true sustenance. They cost its life-blood. They voice the greatest struggles; they mark the highest ideals. They come to us with a divine glow, with a genuine inspiration.

But inspiration is nothing without life, and life is nothing without personality. The Bible is inspired because there are inspired men to-day, who, guided by it, once more bring its thought to us fresh from God. The influence of no book can be judged merely by the extent to which it is read. There are living epistles, inspired by these written ones, which are known and read by all men. There is a descending line through artist, teacher, and pupils; and one of our own poets has said, "Artists are few, teachers are thousands, and the world is large." The pupils may not know the artist, while yet a faithful teacher has inspired them with his spirit and his thought. I suspect that in this way the influence of the Bible far surpasses computation. But while this is a fact to be thankful for, it is hardly the result with which we can be satisfied. If the Bible is good at second hand, it is better at first hand. And all may become artists. Most of us have the time; but we

spend it with inferior books, we go to inferior teachers. "Too seldom do the best of us read the best books." To desire from the heart the best things is a lesson not easily learned.

6. There is also an obstacle of an external sort in the way of appreciative Bible study. The classics are the products of a former age. A foreign language shuts their thought away. The people we meet with are clad differently, think differently, and feel differently, from any now living. To derive a real benefit from their inspirations we must learn their ways and habits. We must transplant ourselves into their age. As the centuries roll by this task becomes at once harder and more easy; harder because our ways are constantly becoming more unlike those of the past, easier because with added culture we are becoming more versatile and sympathetic. It is easier, on the whole, because of the remoteness of the Scriptures, to give up to the burning questions of the day. This is largely right. We ought to throw ourselves into the current, and fight manfully the battles of the moment. Here and now our task is set. Our real work is for our own age. But no life is stable that is not rooted in the past. The hot, impassioned present is unstable and fleeting. Eternity is not here, permanence is not here. The world's true culture cannot be obtained from this source. It is the present become past, frozen in the grasp of some great classic, some Holy Scripture, — it is this that has the true culture value. And it is as thus cultured that we are best able to make history in the present.

7. A great deal of Biblical study in the past has

been unproductive. It has laid false emphasis upon details. It has been made subservient to old-time prejudice and assumption. A great deal of Biblical study in the present is likewise unspiritual, because the great prophet who shall re-tell for the soul the story of Israel's history in the light of modern scholarship is yet to appear. Already, however, much healthy reconstructive work has been done. Some of it is of an enduring order. Very rapidly the permanent is being separated from the transient. All that was inspiring and instructive in the old exegesis yet remains intact. The new principles are getting pretty well established. In the leading schools the study of the Bible is scientific. It should be scientific everywhere. It may easily become so. For this kind of study has been popularized. The processes and results have both been given to us. Every teacher, every educated person, may now know how to interpret the Bible if he will.

8. I say the results have been given to us. It may be thought that by a scientific study of the Bible is meant a merely critical study. This is not so. Just as soon as we get beyond the period of polemics and apolegetics we are ready to proceed to a literary, a moral, and a religious study of the Bible. It is here that the highest powers of the soul are called into play.

As mere discipline, Biblical study, scientifically pursued, is of the most profound and comprehensive order. The languages of the Bible are chief representatives of the two great families of the world, Aryan and Semitic. They are wholly unlike. Very seldom indeed does the same word find its way into both branches. That student of philology must go halting

who knows no language outside his own family. But outside the Aryan tongues no language has a claim equal to that of the Hebrew. Nowhere are the problems of text criticism so fascinating, so clear cut, and so full of revelations of momentous consequence, as those of the Bible. Especially is this true of the Old Testament, where the chief divergent readings come to us in a Greek translation. Then there is the Higher Criticism with its dramatic history, and its tragic promises. No study can offer stronger inducements to mere intellectualism than the critical study of the Biblical literature and history. Our whole philosophy of history is involved. Indeed, some of us approach the Bible without any idea of God's plans in the development of the world. And we leave the study without any idea of God's plan in the Bible. The higher criticism cannot take the first step in such a shiftless manner. A man without a historical sense is wholly at sea as a Bible student. Here is where many of the older scholars failed. They did not catch the first and profoundest lesson of Scripture, that revelation is education; that individual and race are progressive; that the life of the race is the life of the individual writ large and conversely. It is evident, then, that a scientific study of the Bible involves a clear formulation of our conception of God's plans in history. As a mere disciplinary study this is valuable beyond computation. Books must be dated, their occasion and purpose discovered, and the whole Hebrew history reconstructed in the light of these investigations.

9. It is confessed on all sides that the Bible contains a few books, which, from a merely literary point of

view, belong to the few great classics of the world. In the study of these there is offered the best opportunity for literary criticism and appreciation. On the ethical and religious side these literary masterpieces of the Bible are especially inviting. We may and must study critically and scientifically the Bible ideals in morals and religion. We must not be prejudiced at the outset either for or against. We can neither admire all nor condemn all. When our historical criticism has set the various grades in the line of their development, it is the part of the ethical and religious critic to extol or condemn in the light of the morality and religion of the age. And further, it is his forte, so far as possible, to construct in detail the ideal toward which the development tends. Such work involves not only criticism, but appreciation. It is by this work that the very highest powers of the human spirit are disciplined and educated. The true critic is constructive in his work. When he detects the goal of God in history, he throws his whole soul into the work of realizing that goal.

10. The Bible is a cause, a country, and an age, and requires infinite time and infinite toil fully to accomplish its work. The Bible student has need of judgment, of scientific imagination, of philosophic and moral insight. And further, the Bible student needs to be, and if he study the Bible faithfully he will become, a man of the Spirit, a child of God.

11. And this leads to that characteristic of the Bible which is greatest and most precious of all. It is the book of *our* religion. Any impartial study of it will surely create in us a deep sense of the beauty of

its thought, the purity of its ideals, and the uplift of its inspirations. To know it is to love it; to understand it, even in a small measure, is to make it the monitor of our souls. We have a profound interest in the Bible because it is the book of our private devotions and secret musings. We love it because it tells us, in language that we cannot distrust, of God, our heavenly Father, of Jesus, his Son, and of the home of the soul where all is peace and joy and love.

CHAPTER III.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

"We may, I suppose, say that what we mean by inspiration is an influence which gave to those who received it a unique and extraordinary SPIRITUAL INSIGHT, *enabling them thereby, without superseding or suppressing the human faculties, but rather using them as its instruments, to declare in different degrees, and in accordance with the needs or circumstances of particular ages or particular occasions, the mind and purpose of God. Every true and noble thought of man is indeed, in a sense, inspired of God."*

S. R. DRIVER.

UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL LIBRARY
CRANE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
TUFTS UNIVERSITY
MEDFORD 55, MASSACHUSETTS

CHAPTER III.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

1. An angel comes to announce the destruction of Sodom. He speaks Hebrew and the people do not. They hear his voice, but do not understand a word, and he appears to them as a babbler. An apostate Hebrew also stands by and hears the angel's words. He understands everything, but he looks upon the angel as a fanatic and pays no heed to his warning. Lot, too, hears his words and understands them. But, more than this, he sees that it is an angel, believes his message, and flees from Sodom. The messenger and his message are unavailing without certain intellectual and moral preparations. He must be understood, and it must appear reasonable. Nor are these all; certain spiritual requirements are necessary to enable one to judge of the nature of the messenger or of his message. Lot knew it was an angel. But how did he know? The appearance was that of a man, nothing more. In other words, Lot had to be inspired in order to recognize his heavenly messenger. Professor Ladd is perfectly logical when he affirms that an infallible Bible can be of little use, unless there is an infallible Church to perpetuate an infallible recognition and interpretation of its message. This principle in some form has

in fact always been recognized by the Church. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. The Church prays for divine guidance that it may understand and absorb the divine word. But how different from that which the Church asks for was that which Isaiah obtained! He did not proclaim his message as one altogether new and unheard of. His prophecies were but the efforts of a pious Israelite to understand and fulfil the earlier word of Jahveh to Moses. And Moses himself worked upon the basis of the revelations of truth made by yet earlier teachers. So, then, not only is an inspired Church a logical necessity, but it is an actual fact, and it reaches back into a remote and prehistoric past for its beginnings.

The question may be approached from another side. Let us suppose that we have been present at the creation of the world, granting that it took place in substantial accord with the account in Genesis, what would we have seen? Would we have seen the Deity moving about among his materials like an architect or an artist, adding a little here and taking away there, building and remodelling until all was finished? Obviously, no! What we should have seen would not have been in any way unlike mere becoming or growth. God, as spirit, would have been himself unseen. His method of work would have been hid from us as it is now hid from us. We would have seen light suddenly flash forth, but we would have heard no voice but the thunder. We would have seen the green herbs sprouting forth from the earth, but we would not have seen the cause. We would have seen particles of dust assuming the form of a man and at last coming to life. But we would not

have seen God breathing into the nostrils of the clay image. We would have no better evidence for our belief in God than we have now. We would have been compelled in the last resort to take his existence on authority or infer it from his works.

Suppose we had been present when Jeremiah or Paul or Luke wrote his contribution to our Bible, different customs and habits aside, would we have seen anything which we do not see in the study of an author of our own day as he sits writing his book? If we questioned the writer as to motives we would undoubtedly find those of the Biblical writers higher than those of the majority of the authors of our own day. But if we questioned them as to their methods of work, if we asked them as to their inspiration and their authority, we would find their answers as nearly identical as their different temperaments and their different "Zeitgeists" would permit. The Bible would seem to have come into being in the same way as other literatures. Luke in his preface tells us as much. Could we question him as to his inspiration or his infallibility, he could give us nothing that would not be consistent with the spiritual insight and general accuracy of any conscientious writer. I am thoroughly convinced that the majority of the Biblical authors were conscious of no unique and, in our sense, unnatural or supernatural powers. The confessions made by Jeremiah and Ezekiel as to the divineness of their words were not unique confessions in that age. The false prophets appealed to the same authority and in the same terms. And by the same methods as those used by Jahveh's servants, the magicians of the time were believed able to work miracles.

2. The Biblical doctrine of inspiration arose out of the circumstances of early social life, and its relations with the divine. In an age when only the few knew how to read and write, the power to write was looked upon as a miraculous gift of the Deity. And this had taken such firm hold upon the people at the time when writing became common, that the doctrine of inspiration was already too firmly established to be overthrown. Another series of facts conduced to this result which has too often been ignored. In early society the tribe or nation is everything, the individual is nothing. This has been said so often as to become a truism. Yet many of its consequences and implications have escaped us. If the individual is nothing, he may not speak in his own name. In early times truth was supposed to come through the priest, who obtained it by lot; that is, through asking Jahveh questions which could be answered by "yes" or "no," by Urim or Thummin. Jahveh and the nation are alone individuals with the right to speak. Then arose the prophets who were really individualists, but were unconscious of the fact. Amos, for example, comes forward with a new message, a new doctrine. But he does not herald it as his. Who is he, that he should speak? The word is not his, but Jahveh's. So all the prophets, in accord with the early psychology or early conception of society as a unit, merge their individual voice in the voice of the whole, and call it a "thus saith the Lord."

Inspirationism and primitive socialism go together. In an age when the individual is nothing, he must say nothing. If he has a new truth or a new idea he must explain it according to the philosophy of the time. He

must affirm that he is as are his fellows. In speaking he is but a mouthpiece of the Spirit. God is the only individual.

Now, the fact is the prophets were in just this way unconscious of their individuality. They did not know to the full extent the part played in their revelations by their own free, spontaneous mental activity. In fact, just because it was free and spontaneous, they said it is not our message, but God's word. It is not we who speak, but God who speaks in us. Their faith and reason were married in feeling. No distinction was made between what was thought to be true and what was felt to be true.

The new individualism introduced by Ezekiel and Jeremiah prepared the way for the destruction of this naïve point of view. To say that each must suffer for *his own*, not for his people's sins merely, is to throw the individual into a habit of reflection upon his own thoughts and plans, and their consequences and effects.[1] It is to call forcibly to his mind the fact that he thinks his own thoughts, and that they are his own creation just as much as are the movements of his body. And it became the watchword of the new individualism to affirm, —

> "The preparations of the mind belong to man;
> Though the answer of the tongue come from Jahveh."

The Wisdom Literature of the Jews represents just that attitude towards truth which we should expect to

[1] So early as Isaiah's day the better class of minds had come to see that God could not speak to men his highest truths in dreams, for these were illusions; Isaiah xxix. 8. Cf. Pfleiderer's Philosophy of Religion, vol. iii. pp. 32, 33.

find in a soul newly emancipated from a bondage to a crudely conceived solidarity. The individual begins to set up as an authority, not the word of Jahveh to him, but his own individual experience. Job, in the face of the science and theology of his age, quotes his own experience, and makes his name loved for all time by asserting his determination to trust his own experience against the world. What sublime words those are to his friends in which he champions the claims of the new individualism. He exclaims, —

> "What ye know, that know I also;
> I am not inferior to you." [1]

One has but to glance into the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament to become convinced that this new individualism has annihilated the old inspirationism, or view of inspiration. Job, Ecclesiastes, and Proverbs are built upon experience. They are the work of men who put forth divine thoughts as, on one side at least, human creations. Yet the victory of individualism was not yet won. And as a consequence, all the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament is anonymous. While the sages believed in experience, they did not feel that the message would gain by telling whose experience lay at the foundation of the message. The masses did not believe in the word of man; they still clung to him who used the old formula, "thus saith Jahveh." [2]

[1] Genung's Epic of the Inner Life, p. 205.

[2] History repeats itself. Modern philosophy, like the ancient, was a return to experience. And it began with individualism. Said Descartes, "What is truth must show itself true to me." And Locke, with a little more caution, repeats the principle. "I must take care to assert nothing as truth which cannot show itself true to me."

The later prophets are profoundly influenced by the Wisdom Literature, though they still hold to the old forms of expression. A "vision from Jahveh" to the prophets is often identical with a series of thoughts which were the result of investigation and intellectual process.[1] In other words, there is a silent confession from the prophets themselves that their thoughts were running in natural though exalted channels when they conversed with God. When Amos says in viii. 1 that God showed him a basket of summer fruit, we are not to suppose a vision here. It was as natural for Amos to say "God showed me," as for us to say "I saw." One is idealism, the other is realism; one is social, the other is individual.[2] To-day the preacher in beginning a sermon in the style of Amos viii. 1, would say, "As I was looking at a basket of decaying fruit upon my study table this morning, it occurred to me that there the history of our nation was being told." That this is the correct view of these claims to inspiration on the part of the prophets, is shown by the fact that among Arab tribes, where the old solidarity still exists, every act of self-assertion on the part of an Arab is begun with a "thus saith Allah." This does not rob the Old Testament writers of their authority, but by establishing the naturalness and modesty of their claims, it establishes also the grandeur of their message.

[1] Especially does the late author of Chronicles use "vision" in this sense.

[2] A noted German philosopher has said, "We do not think; it thinks in us." And Emerson says, "we do not make our thoughts; our thoughts make us." Possibly after all the psychology of the prophets and poets is correct, and our more material one wrong. Cf. E. Caird's Philosophy of Kant, or Evolution of Religion.

3. "Let us," says Professor Driver, "while we adhere firmly to the fact of inspiration, refrain from defining, and especially from limiting, the range or mode of its operation." The wisdom of these words appears at once when we apply ourselves to the Hebrew Scriptures for a definition of this strange influence which is believed to have given us our Bible. At the outset we are struck with the fact that, according to the Old Testament, not only the men who wrote the Bible, but the men who lived it, were inspired. And we are equally impressed with the fact that, while there is great variety in the language used, there is no distinction whatever made between the kinds of inspiration of these two classes of people. The Spirit of God comes upon Gideon and he does something for Jahveh. The spirit of God comes upon Isaiah and he writes something. The spirit of God comes upon Moses at one time and he writes, at another time and he acts. Not only is this the same spirit, but it operates in the same manner in the various cases. In describing these phenomena the Old Testament writers employ a variety of expressions, which show sometimes the dominant ideas of different ages, and at all times the fact that the effort was being made to describe something spiritual and ideal, and essentially beyond the power of language to describe. The fact was evident, the real essence of the fact was unknown. The spirit is said to come upon a man, or it is breathed into him, or it clothes him like a garment. In another series of passages the spirit is said to touch a man, or to fall or rest upon him. In still another circle of ideas God puts or pours or empties his spirit upon individuals or societies.

According to the Old Testament, then, Samson, Jephthah, and Saul are as much inspired men as Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel. Jahveh helps to the same extent, and by the same means, the man who lives a noble life, and the man who tells for all time the story of it. Inspiration reaches out and takes in every vocation. Moses the lawgiver, Joshua the general, Aaron the priest, Joseph the statesman, Daniel the prophet, and Bezaleel the carpenter, all need and may have the illuminating influence of the divine Spirit to aid and guide them in their work. Only at a later time was a hard and fast line of demarcation drawn between these various forms of inspiration. This appears very clearly from a beautiful passage in Isaiah in which the prophet appeals to the agricultural customs of his people. He speaks of these as inspired or given by God. Yet the agriculturist believes also in a living inspiration along with this received code of rules. If he is truly religious and truly successful in his work, it is because God instructs him.[1] In the Old Testament, then, every faithful servant of God lives an inspired life. God has poured out his spirit upon all flesh. Every vocation that is honorable is sanctified; and to it the true man is called, not by passion or ambition or greed, but by the spirit. Nor has the New Testament departed from these notions. According to it every true Christian is a living epistle, and a living inspired epistle. For the spirit of God is not merely in touch with him, not merely put or poured upon him, but shed abroad in his heart.

An extended study of the various passages in the

[1] Isa. xxviii. 26–29 and W. R. Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, pp. 215, 216.

Old Testament where the inspiration of men in its broad sense is spoken of, reveals the fact that the divine influence operates with various degrees of strength, and by no means in every case continuously. David, who is in some acts so worthy the epithet "a man after God's own heart," is in other deeds quite as obviously a man who "served his own day and generation," and that not too well. So the lives of scarce any of the Old Testament characters are above censure in all points. Job is called a perfect man, yet he confesses that he has uttered folly in his heated dialogue with his friends. He asks his friends, —

> "Do ye think to censure words,
> When they are a despairing man's words to the wind?" [1]

In the case of those men who were inspired for the ordinary duties of their trades, such as Bezaleel, we have no right to assume that their work was infallible and faultless. Their inspiration did not imply that. And, indeed, we hear even the prophets confessing that Jahveh has not told them all; and Jeremiah on one occasion was put to shame by a rival prophet, who broke in pieces a rude yoke he was wearing as a symbol of coming captivity.[2] But even granting that the inspired writers do not clearly reveal and confess their fallibility, by what right, in the light of our present discussion, do we maintain that those who wrote the Bible should be more honest, more trustworthy, more near to God, than those who lived it? If we can de-

[1] Genung's Epic of the Inner Life, p. 169.

[2] Jer. xxvii., xxviii. It was not until a subsequent meeting with Hananiah that Jeremiah had an answer for him (xxviii. 13).

fend for their age the equivocations of Abraham and the patent falsehoods of David, can we not see how a modern critic can defend the publication in 622 B.C. of the Book of Deuteronomy as a work of Moses? These two facts are perfectly analogous, and their significance has never been fully recognized. It is not my purpose here to affirm that Deuteronomy was foisted upon the people under false pretences. Laws grow slowly, and always purport to issue logically out of preceding regulations. This is equally true of modern and ancient law. So there is a residuum of truth in the statement that Deuteronomy is the law of Moses, just as there was a half truth in the statement of Abraham to the king of Egypt that Sarah was his sister.[1] But in both these affirmations there are elements that are inconsistent with modern ideas of truth. And to affirm, on the basis of an unfounded rationalism, that the inspired writers conformed to our ideas of truth, while the inspired characters did not, is to commit one's self to open folly.

4. If this line of argument is correct, we would expect growing accuracy on the part of the writers, as we find them dealing with characters like Job, who conforms to a higher standard of ethics. There are many incidental proofs of this; for while the body of Deuteronomy claims Mosaic authorship, the Book of Job

[1] Not only laws but dictionaries continue to wear the names of their ancient authors. We still speak of Webster's Dictionary. Yet we all know that hundreds of new words have been added since Webster's death, and hundreds of old words have received from one to five new meanings of which Webster himself knew nothing. Imagine proving the early invention of the Bell telephone by affirming that it is defined by Noah Webster, who died in 1843 (four years before Bell was born).

makes no claims for itself. Only late and unfounded traditions ascribe Job to Moses, and Ecclesiastes and Proverbs to Solomon. The books themselves abstain from making any claims at all. In the New Testament writers we meet with the highest forms of inspiration; and while it would not be entirely logical to infer that, because they dealt with a perfect life, they must have written a perfect account, yet there is a strong presumption in favor of the view that the spirit and essential teachings of Jesus are faithfully represented. The first three Gospels are full of the evidences of natural and accurate historical composition; the fourth Gospel and Paul are full of spiritual insight, prophetic fervor, and religious aspiration. Prof. H. G. Mitchell of Boston University seems to be perfectly right in affirming that the doctrine of inspiration is essentially the same in the two Testaments. He certainly believes that we have a better means of getting at it in the books of the more ancient volume. He says, in the language of Piepenbring, that in the Old Testament "we find the expression and experience of a higher life, a life produced by God and devoted to God. Behind these writings we feel the beat of the hearts that inspired them, and behind these hearts we feel a higher power, a divine, regenerating, sanctifying influence." Prof. Mitchell believes these words true of both Testaments. But they do not to him imply infallibility in either. "Paul, at least," he says, "seems to agree with the more ancient sacred writers; for he says not only 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels,' but more explicitly, 'we know in part and we prophesy in part.' Other passages might be cited to

show that, to his mind, inspiration did not imply infallibility."[1]

5. The Old Testament writers certainly do not claim infallibility for their utterances. In Isaiah's time there was a very considerable body of laws in circulation bearing the name of Moses as their lawgiver. To these the people appealed, and refused to listen to the fresh light that had dawned in the prophet's own soul. He cried out against them for this. He affirmed that Jahveh had not ceased to be their God and teacher, and he warned them that they had not yet heard all his word (Isa. xxix. 12–14). Again, in chapters xv., xvi., Isaiah seems to quote from some older prophet an oracle concerning Moab. That prophecy had not been altogether fulfilled; and at a later day Isaiah takes this up, adds to it some very remarkable words, and it is inserted among his own prophecies. The words added are these: "This is the word that Jahveh spake concerning Moab in time past. But now Jahveh hath spoken, saying, Within three years, etc."[2] Jeremiah in a famous chapter accuses God of deceiving him, of prompting him to utter prophecies which were not to come to pass. He is greatly perplexed at all this, and in consequence wishes for death, and would blot from the calendar the day upon which he was born (xx. 7 fol.). Some time after this he happens to be watching a potter at his work. By some chance the vessel he was forming was marred under his hand. The potter at

[1] Magazine of Christian Thought, vol. xi. pp. 193, 194, a most excellent treatment of the subject of Inspiration.

[2] Note how all this is obscured in the effort of the King James translators to carry out their theory of inspiration.

once renounced his original intention, and "made it again another vessel as seemed good." This simple incident had a wonderful effect upon the prophet. It at once occurred to him that, in a higher sense, God too might change his apparent plans, if the conditions upon which they rested changed. It is to be expected that prophecies will fail of fulfilment; for if the people renounce their evil ways, "I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." On the other hand, if from being righteous they become vile, "I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." (Jer. xviii. 1–12). And whereas human hearts are hard, and must be *constrained* to repent and turn to righteousness, the very vehemence and assurance with which a prophet foretells the coming calamity becomes the occasion of its turning aside through the consequent repentance of the people.[1]

A yet more striking example of the conditional nature of the prophetic word is shown in Ezekiel's book. That prophet, reasoning from the movements of the Babylonian army, seemed to foresee, in 586, the immediate and utter destruction of the powerful, rich, and luxurious city of Tyre. He utters his premonitions in most eloquent language, and shows himself a master student of Phenician art and civilization. The blow fell upon Tyre as Ezekiel had predicted. But Tyre did not fall. Nebuchadrezzar was not successful, and was compelled after thirteen years to raise the siege. Ezekiel does not destroy his earlier utterance, or modify it to make it fit the facts, but he merely supplements

[1] The prophet Jonah is even angry because the people repented, and God did not destroy Nineveh as he had said he was going to do.

it. His later oracle does not say that moral considerations entered into the events. He had simply misread the strength of Tyre's fortifications, and the ability of Nebuchadrezzar's army to overthrow the rock-fortress of the city.[1] Ezekiel's second prophecy against Tyre, delivered sixteen years after the first, — both are dated by Ezekiel himself, — is perfectly fair and honorable. He admits that the city was not taken as he had predicted. But, says he, "Nebuchadrezzar caused his army to serve a great service against Tyre. . . . Yet had he no wages, nor his army, from Tyre." And because the king of Babylon could not take Tyre, Jahveh gave him instead the land of Egypt for his reward.

Not only do the prophets change their own oracles, and edit, *post eventum* apparently, many of their discourses, but later prophets again and again come into conflict with the word of their predecessors. Every great Old Testament prophet has his lists of "ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time." Hosea censures Elisha for instigating the wholesale slaughter of the house of Ahab by Jehu,[2] and he thinks it idolatry to worship Jahveh in the form of a bull; but Elijah and Elisha never censure the people for this. The author of Deuteronomy cries out against the use of the obelisks (xii. 3); but Hosea regards these as a legitimate part of the worship of Jahveh (iii. 4). The old Book of the Covenant presupposes an altar in every town, and proclaims this a sanctuary for him who has slain his brother without malice aforethought. (Ex.

[1] Compare Ezek. xxvi. 1–21, especially 10–12 and 21, with xxix. 17–21. Tyre was first taken by Alexander the Great.

[2] Cf. Hosea i. 4, 5, with 2 Kings ix. 1–3; x. 11.

xxi. 14.) Deuteronomy declares that there shall be but one altar in all Palestine, and that one at Jerusalem (Deut. xii. 5 ff.). The same spirit of God, under different conditions, produces a different and often dissimilar revelation. But it is nevertheless the same spirit, and there is underneath it all a common purpose, which is profoundly ethical and religious.

When Jeremiah [1] reverses an old proverb which had for it the authority of an inspired writer, he declared that the earlier statement was not complete, was not infallible. But for its time it may have been a true word of God. That different people and different ages need varied presentations of the truth, adapted to their moral comprehension and religious needs, is explicitly stated by Ezekiel in iii. 4–9, where he says, "All the house of Israel are of an hard forehead and a stiff heart." For this reason Jahveh has made the prophet's forehead "as an adamant, harder than flint." So, too, the New Testament looks upon some of the Old Testament regulations as given because of the hardness of men's hearts — that is, a fallible people must have a fallible Bible. Only as the moral and religious consciousness of a people approaches perfection will their Bible be a perfect book.

6. It cannot be expected that the New Testament will reveal so clearly the idea that revelation through the inspiration of chosen instruments is an education of the race. The books of the New Testament come from practically the same age, and stand upon essentially the same footing. Yet in principle the New Testament supports the interpretation of the facts which

[1] Jer. xxxi. 29, 30, with which compare Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 7.

has been already given. For example, in Heb. i. 1, 2, we find two remarkable adverbs which affirm that God in the past revealed his word to the prophets *in many pieces* and *in many manners*. So, also, in 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, we find this remarkable passage: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." If the prevailing view is the correct one, these words were written at a time when parts of the New Testament writings were taking the place of oral tradition, and when the Old Testament canon was a matter of dispute, and several books were under fire. Now the Christians, from the use made of the Old Testament, knew that to call a book inspired was to call it classical, or reliable and authoritative. In the light of this fact, the words seem to furnish a rule for determining whether or not a particular book is inspired, and not a definition of inspiration itself. If it instructs, corrects, and exhorts, it is a word of God to the reader; if it abounds in errors, exaggerations, and misconceptions, if it does not urge purity of life and nobility of thought, it is not a word of God. But if this principle is to be applied to the separate books, there is apparently no reason why it should not be applied to separate chapters of the same book. Church history affords tacit admission of this; for not only was it decided by vote, and by the vote of a very uncritical Church, what books should constitute our Bible, but several of the books were undergoing a very radical course of editing at the very time when they were the objects of debate. Evidently then at the outset, and

by all parties, they were not considered equally inspired throughout.[1]

Now, what the history of the Old Testament canon shows by example, Paul illustrates in principle. To the individual Paul says, "Hold fast the form of sound words." To the whole Church he says, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels."[2] These are remarkable passages. Paul notices that the tendency of societies is to become too conservative. They hold on to the old. They swallow books whole, and do not discriminate. They marry the form, and refuse to divorce it when the soul has vanished. To these, Paul says the form is transient, it is an earthen vessel. On the other hand, Paul noticed that the individual, the choice, sensitive, and ambitious young man (Timothy) tends to radicalism, so to him he says, "Hold fast the form." At any rate be sure you have it, and know it at its best before you renounce it. And when you would renounce it, do it not as an iconoclast, but as one of a society, and if possible carry them with you to the newer truth, the more perfectly fitting vessel. In Paul (shall we say and the author of 2 Timothy?) then, we find not hard and fast statements telling us what is inspired and authoritative, but certain wise and carefully worded sentences, which are designed to enable us to decide for ourselves as individuals, and society to decide for itself as an organic whole, what writings are helpful and divine, and what are not.

7. "Nothing," says Professor Driver, "is more destructive of the just claims of Christianity than a false

[1] Professor Toy thinks 2 Tim. iii. 16 should be rendered "every writing," that is, every piece of scripture. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 7.

theory of inspiration: nothing has led to more fatal shipwrecks of faith than the acceptance in youth of *a priori* views of what an inspired book must be, which the study of maturer years has demonstrated only too cogently to be untrue to fact."[1] It is the arbitrary assumptions of the older scholars who adopted the cut and dried doctrines of the Jewish Rabbins, that make up the dead weight of this doctrine. Yet there are unwise theories from other sources. To say, for example, with some writers, that God might, had he chosen, have written his Bible on the sky where it would have escaped all errors of transmission, sounds too much like Mill's two and two might be five on some other planet. So, too, to say that God "did not care so much about the accent or grammar or scholarship of his inspired men," is to make God partial to carelessness and ignorance. To say that God does not care how his truth is told, is much the same as saying that he does not care what truth is told, or how we hear. For a misplaced accent may completely alter the meaning of a sentence, and an error of grammar may render a whole clause meaningless.

Again, an erroneous view of inspiration has filled the pages of history with stumbling-blocks and inconsistencies. An interesting example of this is shown in the decree of the officials who, according to the "Scarlet Letter," tried Hester Prynne, or who would have treated such an offence in much the same way as Hawthorne has there described. These men believed in the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Every word of it was to them God's own word. They would not have

[1] Sermons p. 156.

thought of questioning a jot or tittle of the Gospel story. They placed the eighth chapter of John's Gospel on a level with the others. They accepted it as having been dictated to John by the Holy Ghost for their instruction. But strange paradox, surprising irony of progress, we condemn with all our hearts their harsh, unfeeling cruelty, while at the same time we strike the beautiful story of Jesus and the fallen woman out of our Bibles! Is there any connection between these two facts? Are they merely isolated and disjointed cases? or do they, in this connection press the suggestion, that we may be just a mite wrong as to the practical value of certain beliefs? There is a relation between these seeming isolated cases, and that of a very intimate kind. Emerson says if a man makes his living by foul means, God will take out of the man what he puts into his wallet, or words to that effect. If we unduly magnify the importance of intellectual assent, if the world uses narrow means to press a narrow creed, God will take out of the soul what he puts into the creed. The reason some creeds contain so much is because the souls for whom they were fashioned contain so little. On the other hand, the short creed implies that the soul has attained its majority, and does not care to make a boast before men. A belief in plenary inspiration, and the presence of "let him that is without sin among you" in its proper place in John viii., could not make the Puritan elders feel as Hosea felt for his erring wife. What, then, has brought us to Jesus' point of view, if we have at the same time stricken this story from our Bibles?

8. Jesus said to his disciples that it was expedient

that he go away. Only under the guidance of a spiritual force could they become strong and self-dependent. While he was with them they remained children. So, in a sense, unless the old hard and fast doctrine of inspiration go away, the true spirit and meaning of the Bible will not come to us. We shall remain babes in Christ if we do not cease our endless quibble about inspiration, and strive to get some of this divine gift, each one for himself. It is for each one who will have it, and take the pains to deserve it; and it applies not to one vocation alone, but to all. Another consideration, which contains in it the implication of a continued and ever clearer manifestation of the divine in the human life, is the fact that Jesus' departure secured to the Church his spirit. He went away, but the Comforter, Exhorter, or Inspirer came. And it was plainly the idea of the early Christians, that this divine Spirit would continue to quicken the life of the Church. In connection with this thought also, Jesus tells his disciples that they would perform greater works than he had done. These greater works of theirs would need greater words to proclaim them. As a matter of fact, language has improved as much since Christ as have the mechanical arts. And words have manifold richer meanings than formerly. So the very repeating of a sentence of Paul's in one of the more complex and accurate modern languages is a proof of the growing life of the Gospel. In no class of words, perhaps, are the new meanings more noteworthy than in some of these doctrinal words themselves. By giving up erroneous views, we do not always need to give up old words. The word inspiration itself is a term of divine mean-

ing. So, too, those old terms that have been so long used as shibboleths of the different schools need not and ought not to be set aside. We should believe in the *verbal* inspiration of certain passages. The divineness is not in the thought, it is not in the fulness of the passage, but in the peculiar and happy wording of it. There are many such passages. They seem to be verbally inspired. The very words are divine.

Then there is another series of passages where the wording is unimportant. There is nothing at all striking in the language used, nor is there any hint, as we read, that the thought is too great for the words, and is bursting the mechanism of the sentence asunder. The inspiration is in the thought, it is *conceptual* inspiration.

Then there are many passages, and these are especially common in the writings of Hosea and Paul, on which it is easy to formulate and defend a doctrine of *plenary* inspiration. The words are not striking in these passages, the rhetoric is often even bad, and the thought is so inadequately expressed that we are sure the message was not merely intellectual. Yet there is a great soul revealed in the sentence. There is a fulness, an overflow of moral passion and religious fervor, that are grander and more sublime than fine rhetoric or clear thought. It is the divine pleroma. And the inspiration of that writer is plenary inspiration.

9. The proof of the inspiration of the Bible is not to be found in the confessions of its authors. Nor are the fundamental truths of religion dependent upon our belief in inspiration, but the real value of our belief in inspiration is dependent upon our apprehension of

these truths. The Bible is inspired because it is inspiring. And it is to us inspired to just the extent that it reveals to us the eternal things of the spirit. In the present day an author often does his really best work unconsciously, and without the use of means determined upon beforehand. I believe that this has always been true; and, therefore, the words of J. Paterson Smith seem especially significant when he says, "It may, perhaps, be possible for a man to be specially inspired by God without his knowing it." If this is true, are we not forced to the conclusion that inspirations differ only in degree, and that God was not nearer to the past than he is to us, but that he still has his inspired prophets and teachers?

In order that we may lay hold of the fact that God is ever present in human life as the inspirer of all that is noblest and best, we must set aside entirely all narrow and ignoble views of inspiration which confine it to a particular form, a particular age, and a particular people. Mr. Horton has been severely criticized for claiming for the late Rev. Charles G. Finney of Oberlin a special inspiration from God. It is said that Mr. Finney would have been the last to claim such a gift for himself. That is just the point. And no sooner do we put ourselves in the position of Isaiah or Joel, than we see at once that they, too, are very far from claiming for themselves what the dogmatists and the *a priori* theologians have claimed for them.

10. The doctrine of inspiration has had a most wonderful influence upon the development of society. It has not always taken the lead in the right direction, and often it has seemed to actually stand in the way

of advance. Yet the history of education shows that there is in the grand total an infinite gain, when the form is insisted upon as the means of getting at the spirit. It is the very form of sound words that must become the possession of him who would avoid rashness and superficiality. The erroneous part of the doctrine came in placing all books and parts of books upon the same level, and in looking upon them as originating in the divine mind, and that, too, without intimate and vital relations to their own times. Even of the Bible it should be said, "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested." When this is admitted we are ready to make search for the permanent elements in the idea of inspiration itself. The idea of an inspired man and, of an inspired book as the result of that influence, is founded upon the idea that there is a Supreme Being who cares for men, who works in history, and who loves righteousness. In the doctrine of inspiration the Old Testament writers were really formulating and defending the richer and fuller doctrine of the immanent God. The Jews have been accused of worshipping an absentee God; they have been accused of widening unnecessarily and even erroneously the breach between human and divine, between God and nature. There are traces of this, especially in the later literature, when they began to distrust the impulses of the present, and to rely solely upon an interpretation of the past. But in the golden age of the Hebrew religion, inspiration reached out in a healthful way to all men of all occupations, and even nature was instinct with the spirit of God, and sympathized deeply with man's moods and

aspirations. In their doctrine of inspiration the Old Testament writers had hold of the essential truth that God lives and moves and has his being in man, and to a less extent in nature. For nature, too, is instinct with the divine life. It is a revelation of God, and it is inspired of God.

But it is the idea of God in man, the spirit of God in the human heart, that the Old Testament emphasizes. And the New Testament, with its story of the incarnation and of the Holy Spirit in the Church, is but carrying on to perfection the thought of an immanent and transcendent God; and it is this idea which we find to have been the basis of the Old Testament doctrine of inspiration.

CHAPTER IV.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A VALID PROOF OF GOD'S EXISTENCE.

"The subject with which we have now to deal is that of the so-called 'proof of the existence of God.' These proofs have been variously estimated at different times. At the present day they have fallen very greatly out of favor; it is said that they are unnecessary, since they would never produce the belief in God where it did not exist already."

PFLEIDERER.

CHAPTER IV.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A VALID PROOF OF GOD'S EXISTENCE.

1. It has been suggested by many scholars that in our efforts to prove the existence of God, we are but reproducing in our own minds the history of the process whereby the race came to a knowledge of the Supreme Being. This view, when properly formulated and defended, has much to commend it. Prof. J. Caird, in his "Philosophy of Religion," after he has passed adverse criticism upon some of the more material arguments, and moved on to that which to him seems spiritual, rational, and valid, returns to point out that in the light of the higher truth it becomes evident that the more naïve and childlike arguments were also founded upon truth. And had not the higher proofs been valid, the race would never in its childhood have laid hold upon those which were physical and mechanical; men would never have had the perseverance nor the courage to have pushed their thoughts farther onwards, until they arrived at last at a spiritual monotheism. And the proof of the correctness of the step is to be found not alone in *a priori* reasoning, but in historical investigation. Says Pfleiderer, "What the proofs of the existence of God really amount to is a retracing in thought of the way in which the human mind first rose to the consciousness of God, not in thought, but in an antici-

patory and pictorial fashion. If there is reason in human history at all, we may expect to find it in the history of religious thought; and if it is a characteristic of reason to become conscious of itself, we may venture to hope that what it has done immediately in history, it will be able to summon to consciousness in thought, so as to comprehend it as its own, that is to say, as rational and necessary."[1]

2. If the trend of these remarks is correct, then the Old Testament presents one of the strongest, if not the strongest, proof for the existence of God in all literature. At the first blush this seems to be a revolutionary statement; for it has been very generally believed that the Old Testament is without argument, that it assumes everywhere the existence of God, and in fact, that the idea of God is given by specific revelation. The fact is, the existence of God is assumed. But the Hebrew method of developing the idea of God is peculiar. The method assumes the existence of a particular kind of God, and with this conception attacks the problem of existence. If the problem is solved, the God exists, otherwise there is something wrong in the assumption. When it was seen that a particular view of God did not solve the problem of individual sin or sorrow, or of national history, the Hebrews did not rush to the extreme of denying altogether the existence of a Supreme Being, but they enlarged their view of God. They tacitly admitted that their theology was at fault. And so, as time passed, the more complex problems were attacked with a more humane, rational, and universal God, until at last the Hebrew idea of God

[1] Philosophy of Religion, vol. iii. p. 255.

became so world-wide, that by it all or nearly all the problems of history and human experience could be solved, and that, too, in a way at once more rational and more satisfactory than by any other means.

3. Just when the Israelites began to worship Jahveh, and what his attributes were at the outset, it is now impossible to say. The testimony of both historians and prophets, however, goes to show that it was the events of the exodus that first brought to the knowledge of the people the full import of their religion. Whether Jahveh was worshipped by the Hebrew group prior to the exodus, and whether he was a deity native to the Hebrews, or adopted by them from a neighboring tribe, cannot now be affirmed. At any rate, there is no evidence of great value that the religion of the Israelites was greatly different from that of neighboring tribes prior to the time of Moses. But under the hand of Moses the national and political life underwent marked transformations. According to one tradition, the Israelites had not been worshipping Jahveh before his revelation to Moses. According to another tradition, it was not the name, so much as it was the nature, of the national God which underwent changes at the hand of the great lawgiver. We are warranted in saying, in any case, that prior to Moses the religion of the people was tainted with various forms of tribal religion, of idolatry, and even of totemism in its low forms. There was almost a total absence of ethical elements in the religion. The god or gods were not bound to the people, nor the people to them, by anything like a covenant or contract. Such seems to be the fact underlying the divergent traditions which have come

down to us. If there were some before the time of Moses who had higher views than these, they had not made in his time any strong impression upon the people as a whole.

To Moses the problem of the national existence presents itself in such a way as to demand a complete transformation in the religious life. No nation can be secure that is not bound to its deity by eternal and ethical relations. A nation to stand must be founded upon honesty, justice, and truth. This must be the relation of the members to one another. But if so, then they must commune with their God on the same broad, ethical basis. Moses saw, and rightly, that righteousness exalteth a nation. And, as to the ancient civilizations, religion was the centre from which everything proceeded, the religion must be the revelation of a God who loves righteousness.

How the Israelites came to make Jahveh their national God it is impossible to say. Indeed, they themselves could not explain it. They affirmed that they had not chosen Jahveh, but that he had chosen them, and that he had passed by stronger peoples in making his choice. However that may be, it was the Hebrew ethics that created the Hebrew religion; and the Hebrew ethics arose from their keenly reflective and practical tendencies on the one hand, and from their deep religiousness on the other, — a religiousness which of itself, however, could love Baal and Chemosh with as much zest as it loved Jahveh. Jahveh, the national God, was a moral Being. The Baals were soft and sensual, and Chemosh was capricious and cruel. All love for them must in time prove disappointing. The Hebrew God who loved

righteousness could alone love his people with an eternal love.

It was, I think, Moses as judge, prophet, and lawgiver, who produced the ethical religion of the Old Testament.

4. Let us look at Moses a moment as the leader and organizer of his people. It is with Moses that the history of Israel begins. The Book of Genesis closes with a single Israelitish family. These in the beginning of the Book of Exodus have become a great horde. But they are, as yet, by no means a nation. They have no leader, no definite aims and purposes. Their religious life is in a condition as discouraged as that of their political life. As a semi-civilized people on the border of a great nation, maintained there perhaps to shield Egypt from still more barbarous hordes beyond, they begin to be enslaved. This arouses them to a sense of their rights. Moses, who has had objective preparation, perhaps, in a life among the Egyptian nobles, and subjective preparation by a quiet residence in the land of Midian, comes forward as the leader of his people. "He was the soul of the conspiracy which preceded the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt. The whole enterprise was conducted by him in conjunction with other men. In the desert, too, in the attempt to penetrate into the south, and during the stay in the trans-Jordanic districts, he stood at the head of the tribes. He came forward and was revered as the envoy and representative of the Deity. In judicial proceedings his sentence was final." [1] By slow degrees, and as much as was possible in a lifetime, the people during their wan-

[1] Kuenen's Religion of Israel, i. 274.

derings were fused into one. "The camp was, so to speak, at once the cradle in which the nation was nursed, and the smithy in which it was welded into unity; it was also the primitive sanctuary."[1] Under the hand of Moses as leader and organizer, the Israelitish nation began. The story ran that the Hebrews wished permission to leave Egypt and go into the wilderness to worship their God. Whatever value this may have, it is certain that Jahveh was believed to have his abode in one of the peaks of the desert, and it is equally certain that "it was out of the religion of Israel that the commonwealth of Israel unfolded itself." Moses did not create the national God, but a firm belief in his power made Moses' work possible. The later prophets, no doubt, purified the idea, and gave greater definiteness to the national character. But they did not create these; on the contrary, these made them.[2]

5. As judge and prophet, Moses is a conspicuous character. According to Kuenen, Moses labored more in this capacity than in that of lawgiver. The people came to him with their differences, and he decided their disputes. It was believed that he did this on principles of justice and equity.[3] Schultz[4] thinks that Moses' conscience had not been prepared for this work "by study or learning, but by the direct illumination of divine certainty." He credits, as against the priests, the story of Num. xii., and sees in Moses also a true prophet, who not only decided matters of dispute among his people, but exhorted them to settle their own differences, and inspired them with warm and eloquent words of reli-

[1] Wellhausen's History of Israel, 434.
[2] Wellhausen, op. cit. 432.
[3] Kuenen, op. cit. 275.
[4] O. T. Theol., vol. i. 130, 1.

gious insight. According to Wellhausen,[1] Moses, by these daily or weekly decisions, "laid a firm basis for a consuetudinary law and became the originator of the Torah in Israel. In doing this he succeeded in inspiring the national being with that which was the very life of his own soul; through the Torah he gave a definite, positive expression to their sense of nationality and their idea of God." To these three illustrious scholars, then, Moses is not merely a judge whose task it is to decide a case on its merits, or according to the law and the testimony. He is also a teacher and a preacher of religion and of morality; or as the Biblical author would put it, combining the two ideas in one, a preacher of righteousness.

6. Moses' work as lawgiver is certainly not especially emphasized in the older documents. Yet Kuenen[2] is doubtless right in saying that "the collections of laws which were formed at various periods of Israel's history were fearlessly embellished with his name, because it was known that he had laid the foundations of all legislation."

The religious and moral works of Moses, as it seems to me, were herculean. He did not create the Hebrew religion, but he reformed it and gave it an impetus and an authority that it had never possessed. He was not the first to promulgate a pure system of morals; but he was the first to connect such a system with its proper Author, and derive from the connection an ethical religion purer than any then known. Jahveh was not to Moses the only God, he was not the God of the universe. But he was the God of Israel. "For Moses to

[1] Hist. 434, 6, 8. [2] Op. cit. 273.

have given to the Israelites 'an enlightened conception of God' would have been to have given them a stone instead of bread. . . . The so-called 'particularism' of Israel's idea of God was in fact the real strength of Israel's religion: it thus escaped from barren mythologizings, and became free to apply itself to moral tasks. . . . As God of the nation, Jahveh became the God of justice and of right; as God of justice and right, he came to be thought of as the highest, and at last as the only power in heaven and earth."[1] These remarkable words of Wellhausen are but a reaffirmation of earlier words of Kuenen, equally significant: "The great merit of Moses," says he, "lies in the fact that he connected the religious idea with the moral life. Jahveh comes before his people with moral demands and commandments: this is the starting-point of Israel's rich religious development, the germ of those glorious truths which were to ripen in the course of centuries."[2]

Moses was, in the best sense of the word, inspired. His soul was on fire with a love for Jahveh, for his people, and for the truth. That Professor Schultz should believe Moses inspired is a matter of course. But that Wellhausen, whom a recent number of an important religious magazine calls a polytheist, should make such a claim may seem startling. Says he, "One whom the wind and sea obeyed had given him his aid. Behind him stood One higher than he, whose spirit wrought in him and whose arm wrought for him."[3]

I have burdened my chapter with quotations. But it has been done in order to show the most conservative

[1] Wellhausen, 437, 8. [2] Op. cit. 282. [3] Op. cit. 433.

and timid reader that critics whose names they fear are truly religious and reverent, and that really the work of Moses is, on any hypothesis, truly marvellous and assuredly divine.

7. In the Song of Deborah, which is usually believed to be older than any of the documents referring to Moses which have come down to us, we have some interesting lines bearing upon the nature ascribed to the Hebrew Deity during the period of the Judges.[1]

This old song may have been derived by the author of Judges from that old book, several times quoted and referred to in the Old Testament, called the "Book of the Wars of Jahveh." At any rate, the war of which it speaks was a religious war. According to the primitive notion, often expressed, Jahveh is a local and national Deity. He is not equally present in all places at all times. He must come up from his mountain home in the south to help his people. And at his coming the mountains quaked.

> "The earth trembled, the heavens also dropped,
> Yea, the clouds dropped water." [2]

Jahveh, then, here, is a God whose voice is the thunder, whose bow is the iris, whose arrows are the thunderbolts, and whose chariot is the dark, fire-girt, rain-bearing cloud. Surely such a God, inhabiting the lightning-clad peaks of the south, was in very truth a consuming fire. For him the stars that "fought in their courses" for Israel on that day were

[1] Professor Cornill in his Einleitung thinks Judges v. historic and from a contemporary. See also Driver's Introduction, p. 338.

[2] Judges v. 4.

fitting messengers. For him to "be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might" was a glorious ideal. But there was something more than a mere nature Deity in this Jahveh, whose attributes allied him so closely with the elements. He was a God who not only took the trouble to come from Sinai[1] to help his people, but he dealt with them faithfully and justly while helping them. His rule was not arbitrary nor capricious. He never made a promise and failed to keep it. He never inspired a hope that he might torture it and crush it. Never in all the Old Testament do the Hebrews accuse, or see any reason to accuse, their God of being a God who does not keep his promises. It is they, and not Jahveh, who are covenant-breakers. From the dawn to the close of Israelitish history, there is but one strain; and our poet has given it worthy expression in the lines:—

> "Tell of it, ye that ride on white asses,
> Ye that sit on rich carpets,
> And ye that walk by the way,
> Far from the noise of archers in the place of drawing water
> There shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the LORD,
> Even the righteous acts of his rule in Israel."

Righteous acts, of course, did not mean then what they do now. There has been progress in "righteousnesses," just as there has been progress in "rich carpets." Jahveh was righteous at the outset, only to the extent that he would keep his offensive and defensive contract with Israel. But this is sufficient. A contract implies truthfulness and justice in some one thing at least. But this contract was a growing contract,

[1] Judges v. 5.

constantly including more elements, until at length Israel and Jahveh must pursue consistent policies, or all intercourse between them will be impossible. They must both (and this is said for Israel only) be just and truthful in sight and out of sight, or they cannot walk together. As Sir H. Maine has somewhere suggested, we have a whole moral code implicit in the first contract. The righteousnesses mentioned in Judges v. are a valuable beginning. And the Song shows a strong tendency to laud the faithfulness of the people and their leaders, as well as the righteous acts of Jahveh. The poem begins with a pæan in praise of the leaders and the people. These were wars of Jahveh, in which the leaders led and the people made free-will offerings of their own bodies. Such confidence in the justice of their cause merited the divine favor.

8. Neither in the Ten Commandments nor in the early histories do the Israelites give proof of monotheism. Some of them believe that Jahveh is not only a better God for them than any other, but that he is really superior to all other gods; but the masses, to a comparatively late day, believed, as did the author of Judges xi., that Jahveh was the God only of Palestine and of the Israelites. When David is driven out of Palestine, he says he is driven away from God. When Naaman expresses a wish to become a worshipper of Jahveh, whose prophet has cured him of his disease, he is told that he must take some of Jahveh's earth to Syria with him, and so worship Jahveh on his own soil.

The prophet soon saw that such a God could not command the allegiance and respect of a thoughtful man. It is seen that, if God is truly God, he must

make the world and its history an intelligible whole by exercising control over every part of the same. With this problem Amos and especially Isaiah wrestled, and their thought at last finds definite expression in Deuteronomy, 2 Isaiah, and the Priest Code. God is the Creator and Lord of the whole earth. Nothing happens that he has not accomplished. No nation rises, no nation falls, but by his order and permission. Thus it is that history for the Hebrews has a purpose and meaning. Nations, like individuals, have missions. And the doctrine of the One God gives unity to all their thought. It reduces the *tohu* and *bohu* of chaos to a cosmos of beauty and truth.

9. At the outset, too, in the Israelitish religion, Jahveh's form was conceived in a more or less crude manner. The golden calf made by Aaron was, as the people believed, an image of their God. In the northern kingdom in the time of Hosea, as that prophet clearly implies, Jahveh was also worshipped in the form of a bull.[1] Later than this the Hebrew writings of the southern kingdom are still more or less hampered by anthropomorphisms, and these could not originally have been mere figures of speech. But it was finally seen that only a God who was a spirit, and not flesh, could be the God of the universe. It was a spiritual, and not a purely formal, nor a merely physical, control that God exercised over the world.

10. But it was on the moral side that the prophets had their severest struggles with the people. The moral argument for the existence of God was one that

[1] In Isa. i. 24 the Hebrew consonants read "bull" instead of "Holy One."

had to maintain itself by a constant and internecine struggle. Theoretical atheism was in early times a thing unknown. But practical atheism was common; that is, man could not or would not follow the moral argument of the prophets, which led by conclusive logic to a God who was at once spiritual and moral, and interested in the welfare of men. The people said, gods are for the purpose of getting us out of our scrapes. We may chastise our teraphim, but our God may not chastise us. If he can save us at all, he can save us without punishing us. And if so, why does he need to punish us? If we keep his worship going, if we are ready in season and out of season with sacrifices and offerings, feast days and vows, are we not faithful to our covenant? So the people argued with Amos. When he began to urge them to righteousness, and proclaimed that the day of Jahveh was near, they affirmed that they knew it as well as he. But they affirmed that it could not be other than a day of victory, joy, and thanksgiving. Jahveh was their covenant God, he could not throw them over; and if he did, it would be his own loss, for he would then have no worshippers, and would be banished from the number of the gods. Against all this Amos cries out in holy indignation. He lets them know that he cannot and will not believe in any such a God. That God who brought them out of Egypt was, in fact, no such God. Not less important than the work of Moses, was the work of Amos in destroying the old notion of the Deity. His sublime words which have come down to us, still have a message. He says, "You only have I known of all the families: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities."[1]

[1] Amos iii. 2.

What a victory for truth this was! In the popular theology, religion and ethics, rewards and punishments, were not correlatives, but were wholly distinct, and they affirmed the existence of the former, but denied the latter. It was a new and powerful argument for the existence of God when it was affirmed that he must rule the world in justice and truth, meting out to all the rewards and punishments which in the nature of things they had brought down upon their own heads.

11. After it became an accepted belief that there is but one God who is a spirit, or as the Old Testament prefers to say, who has a spirit, there arose a form of scepticism which said that if this is so, then God as spirit cannot interfere at all in human affairs. "Jahveh," said they, "will not do good, neither will he do evil."[1] This could only be met by the counter affirmation that God's control over the world, and over human history, is spiritual and moral rather then physical and mechanical. And especially were the pious Jews fond of affirming, that in human affairs Jahveh ruled through the media of the great prophets, poets, and sages, who were his servants and messengers.

12. If God is a spirit, and rules the world as a spirit, he must seem to rule it through his agents. So then, along with the idea of the spirituality of God, went also a new and higher conception of freedom and responsibility. Isaiah, in his sixth chapter, is free to accept or reject the divine call. But if he accepts it, he consciously accepts also all its responsibilities. Even more spiritually conceived is Jeremiah's account of his call. The divine will was already before his

[1] Zeph. i. 12.

birth preparing him for his work. Yet it is not his work till he himself chooses it. When a prophet has chosen his work he is under obligation to carry it on to completion. If his hand slacks, he robs God. If he fails to tell the whole truth of God, he is responsible for the death of his people. It is Ezekiel who carries this thought to its highest development. And for him this doctrine of mutual responsibility applies to all men, and not to the prophets alone.

13. It is in the Hebrew conception of "God in history," that we find one of the strongest evidences of the grandeur and truthfulness of their thought of God. To human eyes it appeared in 711 or in 701, that Jerusalem must follow in the steps of Samaria and go into captivity. Micah had, without "if" or "and," predicted just such a result. The first three chapters of his book give the evidence for this; and if the earlier prophets were right in saying that Jahveh must visit upon his people all their iniquities, seemingly Micah was right in prophesying as he did. Over against Micah's preaching stood Isaiah's. Isaiah saw that the Hebrew religion was tied up in the Hebrew history, as did all the prophets. But he also saw that this religion was of God, that it had permanent, even if as yet undeveloped, qualities, and as a consequence could not come to a dead stop at this time. If there is any God at all, if history means anything, the nation cannot come to an end now. The people have but half learned the lessons God is teaching. The school must not stop now. If it does, all that we have gained is lost. Isaiah saw that the very existence of the Divine Being demanded a lease of life to the nation, and his doctrine

carried the day. Sennacherib, as his own inscriptions tell us, "shut up Hezekiah like a bird in a cage." But he did not take his city, he did not desecrate the altar of the true God. No doubt Isaiah was helped in his cause by the more pessimistic Micah, who threatened unconditional and immediate overthrow.[1] Had the people not believed Micah they could scarce have obeyed Isaiah. Yet it was Isaiah who saw most deeply into the ways of the spirit. The facts were on Isaiah's side, and showed that his idea of the divine and loving purpose in history was the correct one.

14. To give a complete history of the doctrine of God as it is developed in the Old Testament would be to write an entire Old Testament theology. Some of the lines here started are further developed in other chapters of this book, others must be omitted. But enough has been said to show that the Hebrews started with a purely idolatrous conception of the Deity, and that they rose to spiritual monotheism by dint of their own thinking, living, and working, under the conscious direction of God. Every new and higher view of the divine nature gained by the nation, cost the nation the life-work of a prophet or sage or poet. It was a long and hard struggle. And every attribute of the Deity, which we to-day accept as a matter of course, in the past cost a Hebrew saint his life-blood. It is this dramatic story of the development of Hebrew theology which makes the Old Testament, when read aright, an unanswerable argument in favor of God's existence, an argument which is still valid to-day, and is fast

[1] That Micah should be so interpreted appears from a comparison of Mic. iii. 12 with Jer. xxvi. 18, 19.

becoming the basis of the new Christian Apolegetics. By no means, then, are we to look upon the Biblical religion as "a mere episode on a side-track of evolution." The Bible is the history of the evolution of religion. We find in the Bible the lowest beginnings, and we reach there the loftiest heights. "It is difficult for us to-day to understand how low was the popular conception of the character of God entertained by the Hebrew people at the beginning of their national career."[1] And on the other hand, that picture of the character of God which is furnished by some of the Psalms, by Job and 2 Isaiah, is still a long way ahead of the comprehension of most of us.

[1] Sunderland's Bible: Its Origin, Growth, and Character, p. 209. The whole chapter is admirable.

CHAPTER V.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE MESSIAH.

"We have in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament an organic system constantly advancing on the original lines, and expanding into new and more comprehensive phases with the progress of the centuries. Vast and complex that organism is, — so complex that the wisest sages of Israel could not comprehend it."

C. A. Briggs.

CHAPTER V.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE MESSIAH.

1. An idea which has dominated too exclusively the Biblical study of the past is that which finds expression in the majority of the works on Messianic prophecy. It is assumed that the chief value of the Old Testament lies in its Christology, which by many writers has been developed into a complete and harmonious system, a system built entirely upon the supposed New Testament fulfilment of the very letter of the Hebrew Scriptures. Now, it goes without saying, that those who see in the Old Testament only a book of Messianic prophecy are its worst and most one-sided defenders. One can say with all reverence that he who runs to Paul or to the Gospels with every difficult passage in the Old Testament will never understand that wonderful book. If we would get unbiassed results we must determine to know nothing but the Old Testament and its religion. Only as thus studied can we hope to come to the New Testament with fresh light.

Further, an admission at the outset of the simple naturalness of Jewish Messianism in many of its manifestations will help us. The Messianic hope in one sense is nothing more than that longing for the ideal which is present in all religions, which is still present

in Christianity in various forms, and which lends to our religion much of its motive and its charm. These ideals need not one, but many, fulfilments, in ever widening applications. They are conditioned by the Time-spirit, and in time create the Time-spirit of the future. Not always, to the best of her servants even, does the Time-spirit reveal all her plans, and so we must expect to find in the loftiest of religions many broken ideals and unfulfilled prophecies; and alongside these the oracles of many who builded wiser than they knew, and formed an ideal that neither they nor their fellows knew the meaning of.

2. The Messianic hope of the ancient Hebrews had rude enough beginnings. We seem to meet it first in popular conceptions of a "day of Jahveh," near at hand, in which the national God would come from his home in the south and fight for his people, giving them a glorious victory over their enemies.[1] This would be followed by peace and prosperity. All would be light, joy, and gladness.[2] In the first writing prophets, this hope already centres in the ruling king, as the victorious chief who at once upholds the nation, and the religion of Jahveh. While moral elements were wanting in the popular ideas of the early age, they were plainly conspicuous in the writings of the prophets, and in the prophetic redactions of the history books.

Amos affirms that the Messianic age will be, not an age of bloody victory and sensuous delight, but an age of uprightness and truthfulness under the reign of a

[1] Judg. viii. 22 fol. 1 Sam. viii. 5–8; x. 18 cannot be cited for the early view. These passages are all later than Solomon; but see Piepenbring, O. T. Theol., 218.

[2] Judg. v. 4, 5; Amos v. 14, 18–20.

Davidic king who will rule in righteousness, and judge the people with equity.[1]

Hosea adds out of his own domestic experience a new note to the religion, that of tender love. He looks not only for righteousness and judgment, but for loving kindness and mercy. All this is to come about by seeking "Jahveh their God, and David their king."[2] This king is not David himself, but the Davidic dynasty which reigned at Jerusalem, while at Samaria there reigned, according to Hosea, an usurper. Thus the northern king, Jeroboam II., was not Jahveh's Anointed, i.e., the Messiah or Christ, while the southern king, Ahaz, who was in the line of David, was the Anointed of the Lord.

Isaiah carries this idea much farther. He sees a king to be enthroned in the near future who will establish the Davidic dynasty forever. The name of the son of David who shall bring this about is "Subtle Counsellor, Divine Warrior, Possessor of the Spoils, and Prince of Peace."[3] None but human attributes are given to this prince. It is the dynasty, not the individual king, that is to endure forever, and the rendering "Mighty God" in Revised Version is too strong. The word "God" was, in fact, used very loosely by ancient peoples.

This king, who is perhaps Hezekiah himself, is still further idealized in xi. 1–5. "The spirit of Jahveh shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of

[1] Amos ix. 11, 12, are troublesome. If not post-exilian, the reference is to the restoration of the Davidic dynasty in North Israel.

[2] Hos. iii. 5. [3] Isa. ix. 6, 7.

knowledge, and the fear of Jahveh." Already, as early as Isaiah, then, the Messianic king is given the qualities of the judge, prophet, and civil ruler.[1]

Micah affirms in v. 2, 3, that the hope of the people centres in their king. This king comes of an old and tried family, his "goings forth are from everlasting." In the first place, it is noteworthy that in accordance with Hebrew custom, it is the "house" here, and not the individual, whose age is so great; and secondly the word "everlasting" is used merely in the sense of "very old." The Moabite stone, for example (800 B.C.), says that the tribe of Dan had lived *always* in the land along the eastern banks of the Jordan. This we know was not true. If, instead of "Bethlehem Ephrathah" in Mic. v. 2, we read with most modern scholars, "house of Ephrathah," we have removed the passage out of which grew the later opinion that Messiah must be born in Bethlehem.[2] In any case, Micah has in mind nothing more than a Davidic king, who will, by a just and strong reign, secure victory, peace, and prosperity for the people.

3. Jeremiah follows in the tracks of his predecessors, and looks unto David for a righteous branch who will usher in the golden era.[3] He also places beside the king an everlasting priesthood (xxxiii. 18). Formerly Jeremiah was believed to declare also the divinity, and even the Deity, of the Messiah by the name "Jahveh our righteousness;" and as the name stands it is further suggestive of vicarious atonement. But the name as

[1] Prof. Toy, in Judaism and Christianity, p. 50 note, advocates the view that this section is, like chapters xxiv.–xxvii., later than our prophet Isaiah.

[2] Matt. ii. 6. [3] See, however, Giesebrecht's Commentar.

thus written is contrary to Hebrew syntax. King Joram was not "the Lord most high," but his name affirms that "Jahveh is most high." So Joel was not himself "Jahveh God," but his name tells us that "Jahveh is God." In like manner the name Isaiah gave to the unknown child was Immanuel, "God is with us." And Jeremiah simply means to affirm that the name of their ideal king will declare that "Jahveh is our righteousness." [1]

Ezek. xvii. 22–24 is difficult, but most scholars see in this a reference to the restoration of the direct Davidic line to the throne. In xxi. 27, Ezekiel is doubtful about the how and when, but confident that the kingdom will be at last restored to him whose right it is (*Shiloh*), the Hebrew confirming the third marginal reading of the Revised Version of Gen. xlix. 10. In xxxiv. 23, Ezekiel expects the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, and the new king shall "feed the people and be their shepherd." The new turn which the ideal has taken was suggested by Isaiah and others. But it is narrower than the conception which they possessed, no doubt because the king could hope to be but a vicegerent or Pekah of the Assyrian king. His functions would be religious and educational rather than governmental. Yet Ezekiel has no idea of renouncing the old Messianic hope.[2] Israel shall dwell in the land given unto Jacob, "they and their children and their children's children for-

[1] Some of the older commentators held that Isa. ix. 6 should be translated in the same way. The name would then be, "A wonderful counsellor is the Mighty God, an everlasting Father, a Prince of peace." This would be a very long name, but not longer than that borne by some of the Assyrian kings.

[2] B. Stade says Ezekiel did renounce this hope in chapters xl.–xlviii., where the ruler is called a "prince," not a "king" or "anointed."

ever; and David my servant shall be their prince forever" (xxxvii. 25). Here, as in other similar passages, "David" means the dynasty established by him. The reference is not to an individual king who shall reign forever, for there were to be several of these (xlv. 8, 9). Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel add, as a condition of membership in the Messianic kingdom, the possession of a new heart, upon which the law of God is written.

Zech. ix.–xi. is a peculiar section. It is, perhaps, a discourse of one of the oldest of the prophets edited by one of the latest. According to ix. 10–16, God is himself the Redeemer and Saviour of Israel. And the language implies that the writer had no thought of an individual Messiah.[1] On the other hand, ix. 9 seems to refer to a king after the manner of the pre-exilian prophets.

4. Under the hand of 2 Isaiah, the Messianic hope has completely changed. The national independence has been lost. The cream of the people are in exile. The line of David is no longer in a position to offer a basis for the prophetic hope. But the great unknown prophet is not disheartened. Those gifts and graces which his predecessors bestowed upon David, he transfers to the people.[2] For the time being, at any rate, Cyrus, king of Persia, is the Messiah, the Christ. He is even called Jahveh's shepherd, who shall perform all his pleasure. Through him Jerusalem shall be rebuilt and the temple restored.[3] The Babylonian Isaiah, however, is himself not averse to living apart from his native land. Indeed, there are certain gains to be had

[1] See also Zech. xii. 4–8; xiii. 1, where the country people save Judah.
[2] Isa. lv. 3 *vs.* Acts xiii. 34.
[3] Isa. xliv. 28; xlv. 1–4.

only in exile. Jahveh is now the sanctuary, and the blood of slain beasts no longer flows — in vain.

The Davidic king is entirely wanting in the exilian sections, Isa. xiii., xiv., and xxiv.–xxvi., as also in Zephaniah, Habakkuk, and some of the other prophets. To say with Schultz, "hence the religious hope is not bound up in a particular person," is to explain but half the fact. The truth is, the Messianic hope was the outgrowth, as was all prophecy, of the ideas of the times. A few years under the rule of a son of David would give rise to expectations for the future wholly irreconcilable with others that would arise, and did arise, on foreign soil during the exile, and in Palestine during the rule of the high priests.

5. The prophets of the return once more look to the house of David for the pledge of the divine favor. Haggai calls upon Zerubbabel in the name of Jahveh to be strong. He has been chosen of God for a divine work, and made "as a signet."[1] Zechariah follows in the tracks of his contemporary. Zerubbabel is the branch. Before him the great mountain shall become a plain, "not by might nor by power, but by my spirit,[2] saith Jahveh." Both these prophets place the high priest alongside the Messianic prince as a man second only in importance to him. But there is no hint as yet that the Messiah is to be himself a priest.

Malachi saw nothing in the Davidic princes to inspire hope, and therefore forsakes entirely the notion that

[1] Hag. ii. 21–25.

[2] Zech. iii. 8; iv. 6, 7. In vi. 11, 12, Joshua is called the Branch. Ewald said supply "and Zerubbabel." Smend, A. T. Rel. Geschichte S. 343 n., follows Welthausen's Skizzen V. S. 176, and cuts out "Joshua" as a later priestly emendation, and substitutes "Zerubbabel."

the house of David is to bring back to the people their lost estate. Neither does he return to the idea of the 2 Isaiah, but introduces an entirely new conception. And he unites with it the common, though ever changing, beliefs regarding the day of Jahveh. This was a most troublesome phenomenon in Hebrew thought. When it was near, they desired to have it put off. When it seemed far away in the future, they desired to have it near. This was due to ethical considerations. The day of Jahveh was a day of judgment. If it seemed near when Israel was plunged deeply into sin, it meant punishment and ruin. If it seemed far away in an age when the people were obedient and prosperous, it meant, perchance, a time of backsliding before the final arrival. Only a *deus ex machina* can unravel the tangle and usher in the *dénouement.* There must be a specially provided messenger, who shall prepare the people for the new age and at once usher it in. Malachi had at hand a Biblical character whose peculiar demise fitted him for this new *rôle.* Elijah must be the forerunner, not of the Messiah, but of Jahveh himself.[1] There is a difference of opinion whether Malachi had in mind a purely human messenger, or an angelic being. It is very likely that no clear distinctions were made between the two.

Joel reminds one of Malachi in his use of the day of Jahveh; but he ushers this in with a locust plague, and the blessing of the Messianic age is the result of a universal outpouring of the Spirit by God himself.

6. Daniel (165 B.C.) and the Apocrypha do not mention a Davidic king, at least not in undisputed

[1] Mal. iii. 1; iv. 4–6.

passages. The Book of Daniel is apocalyptic, and many of its sentences are no longer intelligible. Possibly the stone cut out of the mountain without hands was the family of the Maccabees, and the kingdom which was about to be set up, and which would endure forever, was the restored kingdom of David. But the whole description is so abundant in the supernatural, that many modern critics believe that Daniel had in mind an angel prince, uncreated or pre-existent, and so "cut out without hands" (ii. 44, 45). The "son of man" in vii. 13 is now very generally interpreted of a people and not of an individual, because by the various beasts in the preceding part of the chapter nations are meant. Naturally, then, here also we would suppose that it is the chosen people whose "dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away." Prof. Toy makes bold to say that we have in Daniel not an individual Messiah, but a triumphant people.[1] And Schürer says, "the core of Daniel's Messianic hope is the universal dominion of the saints."[2]

According to Baruch iv. 22 (150 B.C.) the Everlasting is the source of joy and salvation. He is even called "our Saviour." Tobit xiii. 10 (150 B.C.) calls the Lord "the everlasting King." The Messianic blessings are described, but these are conferred by God himself. 1 Macc. ii. 57 seems to contradict the passages already cited, in that it says that "David possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom." This, however, need not mean necessarily anything more than a very long dynasty. Wendt is probably right in saying that the reference is to the past and not to the

[1] Judaism and Christianity, p 64. [2] Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14.

future. So, too, the statement in Ecclus. xlvii. 11 that the dynasty of David is of everlasting duration may mean nothing more than that it was of *long* duration.[1]

7. The idea that the Messiah was to be a priest was not hinted at among the prophets. The pre-exilian prophets, in fact, paid little attention to either "priesthood or public worship." To be sure, Ezekiel's Messiah in the ideal section, chaps. xl.–xlviii., maintains the sacrifices of the temple from his own private resources; but he is not himself a priest, he is merely the civil ruler of the returned exiles. Joel and 2 Zechariah, on the other hand, are very favorable to the priests. Neither knows anything of a Davidic ruler; and both seem to believe and teach that the prophets as a class will become extinct, their place being taken by the priests and elders. But they do not mention an individual Messiah. The One Hundred and Tenth Psalm, a production of the Maccabean era, presents us with the picture of a Davidic king who is also a priest. And this had its basis, no doubt, in the fact that the Maccabees were related to both the royal and priestly families. As our prophet Zechariah now reads, Joshua the high priest was named the Branch, and crowned with Messianic dignity.[2] If we suppose that Zechariah's text became illegible here, at a period when the idea of a Davidic king had waned, and the priests were in full power, the substitution of the name Joshua for that of Zerubbabel, which had fallen out, would be natural enough. While, therefore, the Hebrew

[1] For a different view of these passages see Schürer's Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Div. II. vol. ii. pp. 138, 139.

[2] Zech. vi. 11, and above, p. 105, note 2.

Bible contained passages that easily lent themselves to the support of a priestly Messiah, the Jews never took up and developed the idea at all. And the priestly functions of the Messiah, as developed especially in the book of Hebrews, were obviously for the purpose of showing that the ceremonial law was to come to an end in Jesus.[1]

8. The attributes which Isaiah gives to the Messianic princes, which were also the attributes of the prophets, led many to interpret the "prophet like Moses" in Deut. xviii. 15, not of a line of prophets, nor of an individual prophet in the days of Josiah, but of the Messiah himself. By a free rendering of the language of Malachi, that prophet also might be quoted as referring to a Messiah who was to be a prophet. Various passages in the Apocrypha seem to build upon some such ideas as these. For example, the Wisdom of Sirach xlviii. 9, 10, recalls the story of Elijah's ascent into heaven, and then continues that he was "ordained for reproofs in their times . . . and to restore the tribes of Jacob." 1 Mac. xiv. 41 is very explicit, and says that Simon is to be high priest and governor forever (!) "until there should arise a faithful prophet." The Samaritans, who accepted only the Pentateuch, and rejected the remainder of the Old Testament, based their Messianic hope upon Deuteronony, and looked for a prophet, not a king.

9. The canonization of the prophets and histories that followed or immediately preceded the Maccabean period greatly emphasized once more, in the schools of the scribes and among the people, the prophetic Mes-

[1] Stanton's Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 129.

sianic ideals.[1] In the third book of the Sibylline Oracles (126 B.C.) are two remarkable passages. Says the seer: —

"Then shall God send a king from the sun,[2] who shall cause the whole earth to cease from wicked war, when he has slain some and exacted faithful oaths from others. Neither shall he do all these things of his own counsel, but in obedience to the beneficent decrees of the Most High." In the other passage, equally striking, the oracle declares, "when Rome shall rule over Egypt also, uniting it under one yoke, then indeed the supreme kingdom of the King Immortal shall appear among men. And there shall come a pure king, to hold the sceptres of the whole earth for ever and ever as time rolls on."

The Psalms of Solomon (40 B.C.) repeat all that is best in the great pre-exilian prophets regarding the Messiah. But while the prophets manifestly mean the dynasty, the Psalms of Solomon as clearly refer to an individual. And while the prophets have in mind a mere man in the line of David, the apocryphal Psalms give to the Messiah superhuman traits and characteristics, and seem to affirm at once his pre-existence and his immortality.[3] Ethically and religiously, the Mes-

[1] The title of the Hebrew Bible is "Law, Prophets, and Writings." The Law was made Holy Scripture about 440 B.C. The Prophets, including the histories, except Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and omitting Daniel, were made Holy Scripture about 200 B.C. The rest of the Old Testament, some of it not yet written, was canonized about the beginning of the second century of our era.

[2] Sibylline Oracles, III., lines 652 fol. Some read "east" instead of "sun," which is perhaps a mistranslation of קֶדֶם in Mic. v. 2.

[3] See John vii. 27; xii. 34, which seem to reflect current Jewish thought.

siah of these Psalms performs all the functions of the Messiah of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

The Book of Enoch (100 B.C.?), quoted as Holy Scripture by our New Testament epistle of Jude, contains an elaborate and detailed picture of the future. The prophetic ideas are reproduced, though the intense moral and spiritual elements are lacking. Enoch has a personal righteous Messiah, who is reverenced as ruler and judge by the nations. The Messiah of the original Enoch is a man, and not the pre-existing Word, as the later Christian additions to the book describe him. This king is preceded by a deliverer, who was perhaps Judas Maccabeus (168–161) or John Hyrcanus (135–107 B.C.). And his work is conditioned by the return of the people to Jahveh their God.

10. A marked distinction must often be made between the original meaning of an Old Testament passage and its meaning according to the interpretations of the scribes. The Second Psalm could hardly have been Messianic originally. It is merely a song in praise of some newly crowned king. But in the time of Christ, this Psalm was by many regarded as containing an explicit reference to the Messiah, and it is so interpreted in the New Testament.[1] Psalm Forty-five is clearly a marriage song. The details of the ceremony are idealized, to be sure, but nothing more than that is meant. The scribes saw in this at a later time, after the decay of their national life, something which fired their ambitions and fed the Messianic hope. Many of the Psalms, which probably at first had no Messianic reference, are given a distinct Messianic

[1] Heb. i. 5; v. 5.

meaning in the Targums.[1] When these Psalms were no longer true of reigning kings of the Jews, the people began to understand them as referring to him who should come.

Not only in the Targums, but in the Greek translation of the LXX., we find Psalms that affirm the pre-existence and everlastingness of the Messiah. What in the Hebrew is affirmed of the dynasty of David, is in the Greek said of the individual Messiah. The Greek of Ps. lxxvii. 5 says the Messiah "existed before the moon, and will live as long as the sun." This view of Messiah seems to have been more or less common among the Jews of the first century before Christ.[2]

Isaiah's "king Immanuel" was clearly a contemporary prince. The prophet, who was perhaps himself a member of the royal family, would naturally look to Hezekiah or some other king for a living example of an "anointed of Jahveh," who would be at once judge, prophet, and king. In the century preceding Christ, Isaiah's language began to have a meaning that had not yet been realized, and Isa. vii. is added to the list of Messianic prophecies.[3]

Scores of passages all through the Old Testament, that contained originally no hint of a Messiah, began to be narrowed down to predictions of the future, and were robbed of their original character. This scribal exegesis did not create new Messianic ideas, it was used rather to bolster up ideas already formed. Many of these were erroneous, most of them were selfish and materialistic, and, as a rule, they outraged the original intent of the Old Testament authors.

[1] Psalms ii., viii., xvi., xx., xxi., xxii., xlv., lxxii., cx.

[2] Weber's Altsynagogale Theologie, S. 333.

[3] Matt. i. 23.

Gen. iii. 15, often called the "protevangelium," or first gospel, offers a case in point. The original merely asserts the final victory of man over the beasts. The serpent of the chapter cannot be Satan, for the Jews did not yet believe in a Satan. The Palestinian Targum became the authority on which the early Church saw here a reference to the Messiah. The Targum adds at the close of the verse, "there will be a remedy in the days of king Messiah."

Likewise Gen. xlix. 10 is given in the Targum of Onkelos, "until the Messiah come whose is the kingdom." And the later Targum of Jerusalem expands this into the following: "How beautiful is the King Messiah who springs from the house of Judah! He girds his loins and descends and orders the battle against his enemies, and slays their kings and their chief captains; there is no one so mighty as to stand before him." These Targums were not written until after the time of Christ, but they often represent faithfully ideas that were pre-Christian. And certainly many of them were accepted by the early Church in its formative period, and have more or less influenced Christian exegesis ever since. Not only has this occurred in the interpretation of various passages, but in the meanings attached to certain words. Such terms, for example, as "everlasting," "anointed," "Elohim," and "Son of God," that were used very loosely at first, came to have a narrow, dogmatic meaning. The free and spontaneous ideals of the early writers were hardened down into a lifeless system.

11. Yet there was by no means unanimity of opinion in the days of Christ regarding the nature and work of

the Messiah. Each of the divergent ideas regarding the future age, which we have noticed, had its representatives. There were those who looked for salvation only through the seed of David, which it was believed would restore the splendors of the fallen kingdom. This may be said to have been the orthodox idea, and it was ably championed by the scribes and Pharisees. This is the Messianic idea, properly so called. Others held to the idea, which seemed also to fit best their civil condition, that salvation would come through a priestly ruler. Since the loss of their national independence the Jews had really been a priestly kingdom, that is, the supreme ruler of their own blood was the high priest. Naturally, then, some of the Jews looked to the priest, rather than to the long since dethroned dynasty of the past. Others renounced both the foregoing ideas, and looked to Jahveh as alone their Saviour, who would announce his intentions to his people beforehand by means of some prophet, as Jeremiah or Elijah, messengers of his.

Some of the most spiritual seem to have looked deeper into the facts of their religious experience, and to have seen the solidarity of existence, the necessity of religious leadership, and the possibility of hope and salvation through the sufferings of the righteous kernel of the people, and of one righteous servant of Jahveh in particular.[1] In the New Testament these various ideas regarding the future reappear in various forms and combinations. Several passages in the New Testament look to "the prophet" for salvation, by which

[1] Strictly speaking, this was not a Messianic hope, that is, the suffering servant of the Second Isaiah was not Jahveh's "anointed."

they seem to mean "the prophet like Moses" of Deut. xviii. 15.[1] Others looked for the return of Elijah (or even Jeremiah[2]), and were content with the thought that Elijah would prepare the way of Jahveh before him.[3] Others combined this with the Messianic idea. Malachi, as we have seen, does not have a Messianic king, but a prophet who is the forerunner of God himself. The two passages which are combined in Mark i. 2, 3, give a picture of the Messianic times which is nowhere paralleled in the Old Testament. According to Malachi, Jahveh says, "I send my messenger before my face who shall prepare my way before me." By Mark the possessives are changed, so that the meaning is that God will send his forerunner ahead of the Messiah, to prepare the Messiah's way before him. Two ideas of a wholly different character are here combined. Nowhere in the Old Testament are forerunner and Messiah a part of the same conception. Those books which contain the one do not have the other. Many scholars conjecture, however, on the authority of Mark ix. 11, that the union of these two conceptions was not the work of the Christians, but of the Jewish thought of an earlier generation.[4] Possibly, too, the alleged discrepancy between John's Gospel and the Synoptics as to whether the Baptist were really the expected forerunner, is dissolved in the different views prevalent, as to the person for whom he was to prepare the way. A very curious

[1] Acts iii. 22; vii. 37. [2] Matt. xvi. 14.

[3] Matt. xvii. 10; Mark ix. 11; Luke iv. 18; ix. 8; John i. 21.

[4] See Wendt's Teaching of Jesus, vol. i. p. 68. On the divergent Messianic expectations in the times of Christ, see also Cone's Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations, p. 38.

notion seems to have been held by some, in which there were two Messiahs. One of these, a son of Joseph, was the Messiah of the ten tribes, whose mission it was to prepare the way for the other, who was called the Messiah ben David, and who seems to have been given the attributes and graces of the prophetic Messiah.[1]

Many of the details of the various Messianic expectations are lost beyond recall. But, with Wendt, this much may be said, "there was an unwavering expectation of a divinely purposed future dispensation of blessing." Many of these hopes were fantastic. And there seem to be traces of some of them in our Gospels, but nothing so extreme as is to be found in current Jewish literature. For example, the Targums on Isa. ii. 2, and elsewhere, tell how nature will herself be transformed in the Messianic time. Corn-stalks like palm-trees will bear kernels as large as one's head, which will be harvested by the wind. There will grow single grapes large enough to fill a wagon, and from which wine may be drawn as from a cask. Sinai, Tabor, and Carmel will be united into one large mountain, and the city of Jerusalem set upon them. There will be houses three miles high. The country will be full of pearls and gems, and there will be no more of sickness or defect. Only glory and enjoyment will abound for those permitted to share the Messiah's reign. Truly, "having no present, Israel threw itself on the future!" And it is certainly wonderful, that the Gospels and other portions of the New Testament are so free from this wild fancy, which was all but universal in the Jewish world at the time when the facts of the New Testament

[1] Weber's Altsynagogale Theologie, S. 346.

were being made. The Christian Bible undoubtedly has defects and limitations, due to its age and environment. But in no true sense can we say that it had the faults of its age. It did not have them. The grandeur and divineness of the Biblical books is that they each and all rise above their age, and lay hold upon truths that are permanent and eternal.

12. There is no hint in the passages of the Old Testament, or of the Apocryphal writings which are properly called Messianic, that is, which look to a king or prophet for salvation, that the Messiah will suffer for his people or make atonement for them. "Neither in the pre-Christian Jewish literature," says Professor Toy, "nor in the earlier Targums, is there any trace of a suffering Messiah."[1] The personality of the Messiah is one which is clearly and profusely portrayed in the literature of the period immediately preceding the advent of Christianity. There are many passages which associate closely together the forgiveness of sins and the coming of Messiah, but none that represent the Messiah himself as accomplishing that remission in his own person. Indeed, a crucified Christ was to the Jews a stumbling-block. And the disciples themselves could not without effort, until driven to it in fact by the events on Golgotha, bring themselves to believe in a suffering Messiah. The prevailing view, as the Old Testament prophets had long before outlined it, was very different. Repentance and good works must precede, and so make possible, the Messiah's coming. Whether he come early or late, whether he come as a royal prince or as one of the

1 Judaism and Christianity, p. 330, note. With which agree Schürer ii. 184; Stanton, 122, etc.

lowly, depends upon Israel's innocency. So said the later Jews, and the early prophets had prepared them for such a hope. The Messiah, then, was to be a righteous and faithful ruler, a victorious general, a teacher of righteousness, and at last a peaceful Prince. This is still the idea of the Pharisees in the time of Christ, and finds definite expression in the Targums. The prevailing view, though some reversed it, was that Messiah could not come until the people repented and turned unto God. Another important feature of the Messianic hope was, that it did not interfere with the Jewish idea of the temple sacrifices. Whatever the prophets may have taught, the Messiah was not expected, by the scribes and Pharisees, to put an end to animal sacrifice by the sacrifice of his own life. He was rather, as we have said, a prophet-king, who would at once set the example for his people, and rule over them in righteousness and truth. The more spiritual of the prophets may have seen in the Messiah one who would make animal sacrifice unnecessary, and found religion upon repentance, faith, and the new heart. At any rate, all were looking for one who would be in deepest and most perfect sympathy with the people, in intimate relations with God, and fitted by a divine anointing to be an inspired and inspiring teacher, and the herald and organizer of the kingdom of God upon earth. The attributes of the Messiah are all summed up in the word leadership. To be sure, in the Old Testament this leadership is often coarsely conceived and sensuously defined.

But so is it also in some parts of the New Testament, though always at once corrected by the Biblical author.

And the strong men of both Testaments alike censure those who look for anything other than a kingdom of righteousness. We may admit that the best parts of the Old Testament did not foresee the grandeur of Jesus' person and work in its totality, while yet insisting, on purely exegetical grounds, that the Old Testament builds the foundation and furnishes the plan upon which, and in accord with which, the life and doctrines of the New are developed. That basis and foundation is the conception of the leadership of the Messiah. Using the New Testament word, and yet keeping, as I believe, the conception of the Hebrew prophets, we may say that the core of the Messianic doctrine is a sublime faith in the spiritual leadership of Christ. But it is even more than this: it is a faith in Messiah's universal leadership.[1]

It is a noteworthy fact that in the best of the prophets the nations are to be converted to God[2] and recognize his Anointed, — recognize in matters of religion the authority of one who was of the people of David. If we continue to call Jesus the Christ, then, we can do

[1] I leave to the New Testament exegetes to decide whether Jesus himself is to be explained as a man of his times, and yet not of his times in the sense in which other great men are, or whether he is *sui generis*. The presupposition from the Old Testament is clearly in accord with the notion that the Messiah is a man and not God, an inspired prophet and not a ransomer of sinners. But it must be admitted that it is possible that the New Testament contains ideas which are contrary to the notions of the Old. In the words of Lessing, "I leave on one side who the person of Christ was. Many things which were at that time of great weight for the *reception* of his doctrine possess now no longer the same importance for the recognition of the *truth* of his doctrine."

[2] Isa. xlii. 1–6; li. 4, 6; lv. 5; lvi. fol.; Jer. iii. 17; xii. 14; xvi. 19 fol.; Zech. ii. 15.

so on the basis of the Messianic prophecies, only in the sense that he is our teacher and leader, and not in the sense that he has made atonement for our sins. That conception belongs to a wholly different circle of ideas, which will be considered elsewhere. There is nothing new in this view, startling as it may seem to some. It is the view which prevailed in the Church immediately after the death of Christ. The disciples did not believe that Jesus had, by his death, atoned for their sins, but that he had been cruelly slain, and would soon return with power and dominion, and establish a temporal earthly kingdom.[1] Peter's famous sermon in the Acts does not hint at the doctrine of Jesus' expiatory sacrifice. Jesus will return soon in the splendor with which he ascended into heaven. Here the ideas of the pre-exilian prophets reappear, which are correctly defined by Piepenbring, when he says, "all expected the restoration of the dynasty of David, which was to be maintained forever by a perpetual descent."[2] But to maintain with Matthew's introduction, and with the Jewish exegesis of the Old Testament, which was based upon a corrupt text, that Jesus must be born in Bethlehem as a son of David, and his legal successor, is to jumble in hopeless confusion the material and spiritual conceptions of the Christ.[3] It is not, I think, impossible that Jesus, in Mark. xii. 35, meant to deny that he was of the seed of David. There is, at any

[1] Acts i. 6. [2] O.T. Theol., p. 221.

[3] In Mic. v. 1, 2, we should read Beth Ephrath, instead of Bethlehem Ephrath. The incorrect reading gave rise to the Rabbinic idea that the Christ would be born in Bethlehem. See Targum Jerusalem on Gen. xlix. 11; Targ. Jonathan on Zech. x. 3, 4; Isa. xi. 1; Mic. v. 2.

rate, an appearance of artificiality in the genealogies of Jesus given by Matthew and Luke.

While, then, it is more than probable that Jesus' disciples often and persistently misunderstood in what sense he was really the promised Messiah, it is, on the other hand, not improbable that many Jews were in his day looking for just such a fulfilment of the prophets as is furnished by the ideal life portrayed in our Gospels. It can scarce be doubted that "there were some among the Jews, even if they were few and uninfluential, who were prepared to receive the true Messiah. They did not probably differ greatly from others in their formal beliefs, but they did as regards the spirit in which they held them, and the features in the conception of the Messiah and his work which most occupied their thoughts. Deliverance of the nation from sin, and the burden of God's displeasure on account of sin, fuller knowledge of the divine will, glad homage to Jehovah, and goodwill to Israel as his chosen people on the part of the nations of the earth, these had been traits in the prophetic description of the times of redemption of Zion. . . . To the hope of these blessings pious hearts turned instinctively, as the good things which they most desired."[1]

13. The impartial Old Testament exegete will frankly admit that the best parts of the Hebrew Scriptures fail to apprehend clearly, and in all its details, the mission of Jesus of Nazareth who is called Christ. And indeed the best parts of the Old Testament recognize the fact that there is a certain justice in interpreting their prophecies by their fulfilment, whatever that may be.

[1] Stanton's Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 134.

And it is only as we take advantage of this permission extended to us, that we can call Jesus the Christ of God. But while this is true, it would certainly be to tear the Testaments completely asunder to say that the New Testament Messiah was to save the world by his blood, to become righteousness for his people, to ransom their lives with his. In the sense in which these words are usually understood, they imply a total departure from the Old Testament circle of ideas. And presumably, the New Testament writers, building as they did on the Old Testament, would not have advocated such doctrines. We have already seen that Peter's first sermon did not contain these notions. In what sense Jesus was a sacrifice, and in what sense he suffered for the sins of the world, will be discussed elsewhere. These are not a part of the Messiah's work, according to the Hebrew Scriptures. The Messianic idea, as we have seen, the rather emphasized the ideas of teacher, preacher, and leader. That this is a fundamental New Testament idea is shown by these words from a learned New Testament scholar. "It is the duty of the Church to use Jesus' educating personality to perfect human nature; to inforce the lesson of his life, and create his spirit, by presenting him, not as one who stood apart from humanity in rank, or as one who mediates between God and man, but rather as one who realized the moral possibility of man, and showed once for all how men should live; and by so living, made himself a vast educational force." Jesus is the world's greatest prophet; and Old and New Testaments combine in calling the Ideal Man the Wonderful Counsellor, Divine Leader, and Prince of Peace.

CHAPTER VI.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE WAY OF SALVATION.

"The death of Christ is a vicarious offering, provided by God's love for the purpose of satisfying an internal demand of the divine holiness, and of removing an obstacle in the divine mind to the renewal and pardon of sinners."

STRONG'S THEOLOGY.

"For just in the blood of Christ, which God has not spared, lies the proof of his righteousness, which he has exhibited through the setting forth of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice; that shed blood has at once satisfied his justice and demonstrated it before the world."

MEYER'S COMMENTARY.

"Christians have for a long time believed that the temporal death of Christ made an atonement for sin, and that the literal blood of the man who was crucified has efficacy to cleanse from guilt; but surely this is carnality and carnal-mindedness."

BALLOU'S ATONEMENT.

CHAPTER VI.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE WAY OF SALVATION.

I. EARLY IDEAS OF SACRIFICE.

1. It is proposed to discuss historically the Biblical doctrine of atonement with a special look-out for facts which will enable us to determine whether the Old Testament doctrine of sacrifice looks forward to Christ; or whether, on the other hand, the New Testament writers, of necessity, used terms which were then in vogue, and for whose meaning we must appeal to the Old Testament, and in some instances to the Jewish Apocrypha.

2. In the period preceding the great prophets we find that the ideas of justification and reconciliation were exceedingly naïve and undeveloped. Moral elements are conspicuously absent, or they are hopelessly wrapped up in ideas of ceremony and ritual. Just as the common life of the tribe is believed to be maintained by virtue of physical relationships, and by virtue of the periodic participation in a common meal, so the common life of the god and his people is believed to consist in the fact that they are physically his sons. He partakes with them at the sacrifice of the common meal. The same animal sustains god and worshippers.

The eating together makes them all of one flesh. So long as the common food remains in their bodies they share a common life. To injure one another would be self-destruction. At a very early date the flesh of the sacrifice was eaten alive by the worshippers, and a portion of the still quivering flesh was offered to the Deity, or more often the warm blood was symbolically conveyed to him.

3. The early ritual of the feast of the Passover is suggestive of just such a feast. The lamb is slain and eaten in so short a time that the cooking must have been slighted, if indeed the animal heat was as yet out of the flesh. From the analogy of Arabic sacrifices of which we know the whole ritual, it would seem that the injunction that the passover be eaten in haste, and that no part be left until the morning, came from a time when the lamb was eaten raw early in the morning before daybreak. In striking confirmation of this is the fact that the latest Pentateuchal lawgiver gives a special warning against eating the flesh of the Passover raw,[1] and the earlier Pentateuchal author ordains that none of the flesh be left until the morning. The morning here referred to is the same morning on which the feast is held. "In this sacrifice, then," says Robertson Smith, speaking of a similar practice of early Semitism, "the significant factors are two: the conveyance of the living blood to the godhead, and the absorption of the living flesh and blood into the flesh and blood of the worshipper."[2] The union between God and worshipper, then, is due to the fact that they are sustained by a common life.

[1] W. R. Smith, Rel. Sem., pp. 324, 326. [2] Rel. Sem., p. 320.

4. Passages without number from the earlier Old Testament books come to mind, in which this idea of sacrifice is prominent. In all the early writers a sacrifice is a common feast, and it is a season of thanksgiving and rejoicing. 1 Sam. ix. 13, for example, shows this. A remarkable passage of similar import occurs in 1 Sam. xiv. The army has been fighting for a long period without food. After the battle they, in their mad hunger, slew animals taken as spoil, and ate without formally inviting Jahveh to partake with them. This shocked Saul; and he hastily constructed a small altar and offered Jahveh his portion, after which the sacrificial feast proceeded joyously.

There is in all this no hint of atonement; the sacrifice is nothing more than a common meal of the god and his worshippers, by which the identity of their aims and interests are vividly set forth.

Even in the latest Jewish legislation the meat of the sacrifice continues to be called the food of Jahveh.[1]

5. Self-mutilation of any kind was prohibited among the Hebrews. But in those cases (which must have occurred, for the Old Testament forbids them) where a man cuts himself, and offers his own flesh or blood or hair to appease the wrath of an injured neighbor or Deity, the idea is not that the offering atones for the crime committed. For, to confine ourselves to one case, the blood thus shed is subsequently used in a ritual act, which symbolizes the fact that the blood-covenant, or life-bond, has been restored between the two parties.[2] This is confirmed by the Hebrew idiom in all the earlier

[1] Lev. iii. 11, with which compare Num. xv.

[2] W. R. Smith, Rel. Sem., 319.

books of the Old Testament. Always it is said he or they "cut a contract." Without the shedding of blood there was no contract or covenant. This proclaimed that if either violated his word, there would be blood between them, while so long as the contract was unviolated they were of common blood.[1] Such sacrifice, then, symbolizes communion, not vicarious atonement.

6. Another idea of sacrifice is also prominent in the earlier books of the Old Testament, to which we must now give attention. The old Hebrew word for "offering" means, strictly speaking, a "gift." It is a gift to win the favor of the Deity, or to restore it if anything has occurred to arouse his anger against the worshipper. The offerings of Cain and Abel, in Gen. iv., are just such gifts to the Deity and nothing more. A gift, it was believed, would "smooth the face of the Deity and make him gracious."[2] The preference of the Deity for the offering of Abel means only this, that the author of Gen. iv. hated Canaanite ways and Canaanite agriculture, and favored the patriarchal life and shepherd offerings. It has no reference whatever to the future shed blood of Christ. The offering of a *minhah* or *qorban* to the Deity, then, has atoning force only to the extent that it pleases the Deity and purchases his favor. It was the ancient Greek idea also that "gifts persuade the gods," and it is found scarcely modified in Ex. xxiii. 15; and 1 Sam xiii. 12; xxvi. 19.

7. A third form of early sacrifice which is deserving of attention is the expiatory offering. Here the idea seems to be that the sacrifice of the victim, or the blood

[1] See Gen. xv.; Ex. xxiv.; and Jer. xxxiv. 17–20.
[2] W. R. Smith, Rel. Sem., 328.

of the victim sprinkled upon the sinner, has power to cleanse of ceremonial impurity. An early example is furnished us in Deuteronomy, where the ritual is given to make atonement for a murdered man found in the field. First, it must be ascertained by actual measurement to what village the dead man's body lies nearest. Then that village is to assume the guilt and make atonement. But here, obviously, there was no intentional sin of the community that thus assumes the responsibility for the unfortunate man's death. And, further, the sacrifice seems to be effective, not from the fact that the victim is a ransom for sin, but from the ancient belief that the blood purifies. This point indeed is made clear by the fact that, in later times, a man who had been made unclean by handling the Sacred Scriptures or any other "most holy thing" was compelled to offer an expiatory sacrifice.[1]

8. However, there are cases in which the victim seems to be conceived as a ransom, or perhaps even as a substitute, though this is very doubtful; yet in every case, so far as I know, the sin in question was purely ceremonial, most often, indeed, a sin of inadvertence.

There were, to be sure, corruptions in later times of these naïve ideas of sacrifice. But in the time of Christ, sacrifice was universally looked upon as significant in some one of the forms named. As a rule, in fact, the underlying idea was clearly that of a gift. "Sacrifice is a gift made to the Deity as if he were a man," says Tylor. And writers on the religion of ancient Greece affirm that the sacrifice falls merely under the general notion of gifts.

[1] W. R. Smith, Rel. Sem., 405.

II. EARLY REACTIONS.

9. Against these crude and childish ideas as to the proper means of securing or getting back the favor of the Deity, we have in the Old Testament three noble protests coming from the prophet, the sage, and the poet. Let us look at these in order.

The prophets resisted the doctrine that there is a physical kinship between the Deity and his people. They also scoffed the idea that God had need of any gifts of physical worth that men could bestow. His likes and dislikes were conditioned upon moral worth, not upon the size of material offerings. Says Samuel, according to one of his later biographers (750 B.C.), "Hath Jahveh as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jahveh? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."[1] Says Amos (760 B.C.), with what I think was at the time startling originality, or better, divinely imparted insight, "I [Jahveh] hate, I despise your feasts, I will not smell the savor of your appointed[2] festivities." God has no smellers. You can't win his favor by tickling his nostrils with boiling meat and with incense. "Yea," continues our prophet, "though ye offer me your burnt offerings and meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not bear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters, and

[1] 1 Sam. xv. 22.

[2] Of course not "solemn," R. V., in the sense of sad, but as above, which was the original meaning of solemn.

righteousness as a mighty stream."[1] Hosea (740 B.C.) does not differ from nor fall behind Amos. He says, "Though I write for him [Ephraim] my law in ten thousands, they are counted as a strange thing. As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it; but Jahveh accepteth them not; now will he remember their iniquity and visit their sins."[2] As the years pass by, the prophets state their views with more boldness and with more clearness. The oft-quoted passage of Isaiah illustrates this, and I give it here according to the translation of Canon Cheyne: "Of what use is the multitude of your sacrifices to me? saith Jahveh; I am satiated with the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts, and in the blood of bullocks and lambs and he-goats I have no pleasure. When ye come to see my face, who hath required this at your hands — to trample my courts? Bring no more false offerings: a sweet-smoke is an abomination to me: the new moon and the Sabbath, the calling of a convocation — I cannot bear wickedness together with an appointed feast. Your new moons and your set days my soul hateth, they are an encumbrance to me, I am weary of bearing them. . . . Wash ye, make you clean, take away the evil of your works from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek out justice, righten the violent man, do justice to the orphan, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us bring our dispute to an end, saith Jahveh. Though your sins be as scarlet they shall become white as snow, though they be red as crimson, they shall become as wool."[3]

[1] Amos v. 21–24. [2] Hosea viii. 12–13. [3] Isa. i. 11–18.

The climax of all this prophetic doctrine regarding sacrifices is reached by the author of the sixth chapter of Micah, who, perhaps, wrote considerably later than Isaiah.[1] He says, "Wherewith shall I come before Jahveh, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will Jahveh be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jahveh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."[2]

The prophetic point of view assumes a slightly different form in Jeremiah.[3] He attacks the sacrificial idea by attacking its authority. According to him Moses was a prophet himself and not a priest, and had never given the commands regarding the manner and legitimacy of sacrifice to which the royal priests and prophets made their appeals. Says he, "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: But this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." The emphasis is here clearly upon the living, prophetic voice of God. The people were lapsing into legalism and formalism. Jeremiah wishes to recall them from this; and he does so by proclaiming Moses a prophet, and by emphasizing the fact that the message of the

[1] Wellhausen's Kleine Propheten, on Mic.

[2] Mic. vi. 6–8.

[3] Jer. vii. 21–26.

prophets was the voice of God. And a prophet like Moses the people would ever have with them.[1]

10. The prophetical idea of atonement, which also lies at the bottom of the purely ethical portions of the law, runs to the effect that sins which are also crimes are pardonable only as the proper punishment is endured. The same idea is found in the Old Testament prophets and in the Gorgias of Plato. The way back to God is through punishment. Atonement is out of the question until restitution has been made. But restitution having been made, no animal or other sacrifice is necessary. God has already forgiven the transgressor. When sacrifices are spoken of they are, as Schultz remarks, "transfigured by the prophets into spiritual thank offerings." [2] The process of salvation is clearly outlined in the prophetic theology. There must be sorrow for sin, repentance, and reformation. These are followed by forgiveness, reconciliation, and spiritual blessing. Sacrifices are simply left out of account. "God has the full right to forgive sin, absolutely, without regard to legal compensation and satisfaction." [3]

The prophetic doctrine of faith as a means of appropriating the free and gracious gift of salvation is simple and clear, but very elastic. Faith or trust in God is not distinguished from faith in a fellow being. But as God is not flesh as man is, faith in him always involves a belief in the supreme reality of spiritual things. Faith in God, then, is spiritual insight. It refuses to draw inferences from isolated material things here and there, but seeks for the eternal and unseen grounds and guaranties of action. But the ethical life also consists in

[1] Deut. xviii. [2] O. T. Theol., ii. 96. [3] Op. cit., 99.

the fact that acts are not judged in their immediate effects, but in their unseen motives and consequences. Hence the prophets are right in saying that without faith there is no morality. Without a belief in an eternal and spiritual order, ethics drop to the realm of utilities and casuistries. How close all this is to the New Testament doctrine of salvation by faith, I have no need to point out. Indeed, the watchword in the doc trine of Paul, "the just shall live by faith," is a quotation from the Old Testament prophet Habakkuk.[1]

11. Let us look at the protest against the sacrificial idea of atonement as it has come down to us in the writings of the sages. By the sages I mean the schools of wise men who have given us the Books of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.

The end aimed at in Hebrew philosophy, if it may be called a philosophy, was wisdom, but always divine wisdom, which included ethics and religion, and was identical with communion with the Allwise. Those who sought wisdom, those who possessed a complete and rational view of life, were at once admitted into the presence of God. God is not here represented as primarily a God of love, but as a God of wisdom. And he takes especial delight in those who choose wisely from among their life's experiences, and reduce these to something like system.[2] God has set the world-age in man's heart. In reading out the secret of his own nature, man finds God and the true ideal of society.

[1] Hab. ii. 4. Cf. also Isa. xxviii. 16, where it is also affirmed that the man of faith is a man of steadfastness, because he believes in eternal and unchangeable things.

[2] Schultz, ii. 84.

Here, again, there is no doctrine of atonement. When sacrifices are mentioned, it is in a way more or less figurative. The only mediator needed is one who shall proclaim that they who seek after God in right thinking and right living will find him.

12. In modern life there is a third powerful protest against irrational theology. In addition to the Universalist and the Unitarian we have the Poet. So in ancient Israel the most truly religious of the Psalms soar away up out of sight and sound of the received doctrines of sacrificial reconciliation. Psalms Thirty-two and Fifty-one may be chosen as typical illustrations of this.[1] It is here implied that sin shuts men away from God, not God away from men. But this separation is purely subjective, and may and should be overcome. Do not, says the poet to his fellows, behave like a prancing steed that will not come near without bit and bridle. Do not fear God, he will not repel you. Confess your transgressions and he will forgive the iniquity of your sins. Do not think either that you must bribe him over to your side, or purchase his favor, or bring a substitute to bear your sin. He has no pleasure in sacrifices or burnt offerings.

> "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit;
> A broken and a contrite heart,
> O God, thou wilt not despise."

It would be hard to find anywhere a keener sense of sin or a firmer faith in the loving kindness and tender mercy of God than that contained in the Fifty-first Psalm.

[1] See Cheyne and others on li. 18, 19.

13. It is worthy of note, if I may be permitted the digression, that Buddhism aligns itself with the prophets, sages, and poets on this question.

Buddha said, "If a man live a hundred years and engage the whole of his time and attention in religious offering to the gods, sacrificing elephants and horses and other life, all this is not equal to one act of pure love in saving life!" Buddha denounced animal sacrifices as in themselves wrong: to him all life was sacred.

III. THE PRIESTLY COUNTER-REFORMATION.

14. No ecclesiasticism, however firmly grounded in popular prejudice, can withstand such protests as those that we have noticed, without undergoing a counter-reformation. Let us, therefore, look at the legal and sacrificial ideas of atonement as they appear in the post-exilian writers. We will dismiss Ezekiel, Zechariah, Haggai, Joel, and some others, with the hint that they, doubtless, had much to do in bringing this counter-reformation about.

15. When we turn to the offerings of the Levitical law, we are surprised to find how large a number of them are no longer sacrifices, but fines and dues for maintaining the priests, and the elaborate system of praiseworthy charities managed by the Jewish Church.[1] In passages like Lev. v. 11, sacrifices are reduced to the lowest possible limit. The daily meal and drink offerings of which Joel so often speaks, required a surprisingly small quantity of flour and wine. In fact, many Jews before the time of Christ had, doubtless, come

[1] Wellhausen's History, p. 73.

to look upon the sacrifices as small indeed in value as compared with the study of the law.[1]

When we turn to these offerings themselves, and note the character of the sins for which they avail, we are surprised to find that they are for sins of ignorance, or for omissions and misdemeanors in regard to which there may have been a real perplexity of conscience, the conscience not yet having pronounced judgment at the time when some decision was forced upon the offender.

Let us look at these in detail. The sin-offering in Lev. iv. 2 is clear enough. He is guilty who shall sin by mistake in any of the things which Jahveh hath commanded, and a sin-offering is due from him. The variations from the first test case, cited in other parts of the chapter, and in v. 15, 17, are equally clear.

The law of the guilt-offering in Lev. v. is not quite so easily understood. Verse 1 seems to be badly put. Yet scholars find in it some such meaning as this: A witness appearing, say for a man that he knows to be innocent, forgets the best part of his testimony in the flurry of being called before the court, and the innocent man is condemned. Such a witness is guilty. He has been careless or thoughtless, or he has caught a panic when he should have been made morally strong by his sense of right.[2]

Verses 2, 3, are purely ceremonial. A man without knowing it is made unclean by some means, and subsequently does what the law forbids an unclean person to do. Possibly the offence consisted in walking over

[1] Weber's Altsynagogale Theologie, S. 38 ff.

[2] See Toy, Judaism and Christianity, p. 226.

the grave of some dead man. The offender is guilty, and the act costs a lamb or a kid.

Verse 4 has to do with rash promises and oaths. The language here clearly implies that the offender's intentions were good, but he was rash or thoughtless, as was Herod, for example, when he made the promise that cost the life of John Baptist.

Lev. vi. 1–7 seems at first sight to be even more perplexing than v. 1. That is, it looks as though the writer intended to say that a man could cheat his neighbor out of five thousand shekels, and make it all right with Jahveh, by sending up to the temple five shekels of the spoils wherewith to buy a ram for a guilt-offering. The passage runs as follows: "If any one sin, and commit a trespass against Jahveh, and deal falsely with his neighbor in a matter of deposit, or of bargain, or of robbery, or have oppressed his neighbor, or have found that which was lost, and deal falsely therein, and swear to a lie: in any of all these that a man doeth, *sinning therein;* then it shall be, *if he hath sinned,* and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took, . . . and bring his guilt-offering unto Jahveh." Now, the whole of this passage has its secret in the repetition of the "if" idea. If it is perfectly evident that the man has sinned, why the reiteration of the "if"? The fact is, it was not evident at the time. The language, especially its literary dependence upon Ex. xxii. 7–13, clearly shows this. It was a case of real perplexity of conscience. Let us enlarge upon one detail of the passage by way of illustration. In the great bulk of our trade to-day we have one known quantity in almost every exchange of goods. In ancient times

when trade was, between neighbors, largely barter, there were two unknown quantities. Suppose a man exchanges two cows for a horse, often he could not tell the relative value of the two cows and the horse until he had owned them all for a certain length of time. Then, when experience brings it to his notice, he becomes aware of the fact that he knew all the time that he was cheating his neighbor.

16. Now, in modern ethics, sins of ignorance, unless the ignorance is "criminally acquired," are not sins. In modern ethics, too, the existence of real perplexities of conscience is admitted. And it is also claimed that one may decide amiss in such a case, without being guilty of sin. The future alone could decide whether the act were good or bad. Moderns say that the ignorant offender must take the consequences of his blunders. So said the Levitical law. It is said of these ignorant, conscience-perplexed offenders, one after another, "He is guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." That does not mean that the ram shall bear it, or that he bears it in the loss of his ram. But he bears his iniquity in taking the punishment prescribed by the laws of nature and of civil society.

In exact agreement with Leviticus is the book of Hebrews. According to Heb. ix. 7 (R. V.), the High Priest offers sacrifices "for the ignorances of the people." But the author of Hebrews goes farther, and declares, as does Paul, that sins of this kind are formal rather than real, and that the sacrificial means of atonement is of the same nature. "Gifts and sacrifices cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only carnal ordinances, imposed until a

time of reformation. . . . For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." [1]

In no case, then, will a sacrifice enable a man to escape the consequences of moral transgression. But why must another take them, we ask, if the offender must bear them himself? Where is the substitution? In what does the ransom consist? Obviously the venerable Bishop Burnett was altogether wrong when he wrote, "The notion of an expiatory sacrifice which was there when the New Testament was writ, well understood all the world over, both by Jews and Gentiles, was this: that the sin of one person was transferred on a man or a beast, who upon that was devoted or offered to God, and suffered in the room of the offending person." [2] And Professor Schultz is right in saying, "The sin-offering and guilt-offering of the Torah are admissible only in cases where there has been no wicked intention." [3]

17. Some scholars have tried to show that the ideas that underlay the ceremonies of the "day of atonement" were of a somewhat different nature, and do imply a belief in substitutionary atonement. In the first place, it should be said that the part played by the scapegoat in the "day of atonement" is essentially foreign to the religion of the Old Testament, and the idea cannot with certainty be said to appear in the New Testament at all. The account of the sacrifice is given

[1] Heb. ix. 7–10, x. 1–4, and Cone's Gospel and Its Earliest Interpretations, p. 240 fol.

[2] Quoted by Professor Everett, Gospel of Paul, p. 4.

[3] Schultz's Old Testament Theology, vol. ii. p. 307. See also Piepenbring's Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 309–316.

in Lev. xvi. Two goats are chosen; and of these one is appointed by lot for a sacrifice, and the other is loaded with the sins of the people, and is driven away into the wilderness.[1] The whole chapter seems to be a transformation of an earlier idea, in which it was believed that there was in the wilderness a place of sin, where all sins belonged, and that it was the function of the scapegoat to bear them thither to Azazel.[2] The idea that in the ordinary sacrifice the sins of the people are transferred to the victim by the imposition of the hands of the priest is contradicted by the fact that it is not the goat which is sacrificed that bears the sins of the people, but the other goat which is thereby rendered unclean and unholy. But the flesh of the sacrificial victim is, in fact, always holy; it is spoken of as the food of God: and the blood of the victim had power to cleanse and make holy the people or the altar tables and vessels that were sprinkled with it.[3] When, therefore, the book of Hebrews affirms that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, it refers to the purifying powers of the blood, and not to the fact that one creature must die for the sins of another.[4]

[1] Kuenen thinks Lev. xvi. an integral part of Ezra's law-book. Oort cuts out part of it. Reuss and Zunz think it a later semi-heathen importation. Cf. Kuenen's Hexateuch, pp. 86, 311, 312; Lev. xxiii. 26–32, and Num xxix. 7–11.

[2] "Azazel" may mean this realm of sin in the wilderness, or the demon that presides over it. Compare the similar notion of a place of sin in Zech. v. 5–11.

[3] Cave's Spiritual Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 129 fol.

[4] Hebrews ix. 22, considerably modified from Lev. xvii. 11.

IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

18. In the light of the discussion as it has progressed thus far, what presumably does Paul, to single out the greatest New Testament theologian, mean when he speaks of "sacrifice" and "faith" in connection with the justification and reconciliation secured to us by Jesus Christ? Is his idea of sacrifice different from that of the law? If not, Christ's sacrifice, even if conceived literally, can do no more than free us from sins of ignorance, which, according to modern notions, are not sins at all. Yet, to Jewish notions, these sins of ignorance were often just the only things that repelled the divine favor. According to the late prologue of the Book of Job, that patriarch regularly offered sacrifices to God for each of his sons, lest, perchance, they had unwittingly sinned against the Deity.[1] The great day of atonement among the later Jews was a sacrifice in which all Israel, as an organic unit, was set free from any evil consequences that might come to them through sins of ignorance. This atonement was universal. So according to Paul the sacrifice of Christ was suited, once for all, to remove from every man any feeling of dread that might haunt him, lest in a moment of thoughtlessness he had done or said something that might alienate him forever from his God. Again and again Paul speaks of the atonement made by Christ as something which would benefit men whether they would or no. Ritschl apprehended clearly the fact that Paul's view of atonement was social; that his own language implies that it must be

[1] Job i. 5.

so, unless we limit all his broader statements by his narrower ones.[1] It is the world as a whole for which atonement is made by Christ. And they who come unto God by him realize in a special sense that this is true. He who believes in Christ has no need any longer to offer sacrifice at the temple.

Paul took to heart the language of Gal. iii. 10, as "John Ward, Preacher," did the doctrine of hell. It was to his sensitive nature a terrible, haunting reality. All were under a curse; all were doomed to a life of torture in the age to come. To be sure, in the time of Christ the means of reconciliation in the Jewish theology were legion. But dangers also were legion and imminent. A man never knew when he might be doing something that was ceremonially or ethically wrong. It needed an expert to keep the law. So, as Weber truly says, a man never knew just how he, as an individual, stood with his God. Against all this the nobility in Paul's soul revolts. Grant that all are under a curse, it is not possible that God can damn the whole race. There must be many saved. Human nature and divine love alike demand it. The law had to be abrogated, and it was abrogated in Christ. All artificial and imaginary barriers between God and man are torn away. God henceforth looks upon the heart and its intentions, and not upon the sins of ignorance. While, therefore, the atonement, according to Paul, avails for every man, he agrees, on the other hand, with the ancient author, who says, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, Jahveh will not hear me." In other words, while the death of Christ atones for sins of inadver-

[1] Pfleiderer's Development of Theology, p. 193.

tence, it does not atone for wilful sins; nor is Christ a real Saviour, except by the exercise of those powers of uprightness, love, and faith which he himself exercised.

How, according to St. Paul, did the death of Christ reconcile men to God? How did it free men from the evil consequences of sins that must inadvertently or of necessity have been committed. In this way. He who did not keep the whole law was guilty of breaking it all, or, in other words, was altogether a transgressor. But to keep it all was an impossibility, because of its very multiplicity of ceremonial and ethical details. Therefore, God had counted all under sin. Christ redeemed the world, not by taking its sins, but by being the medium for declaring void that which made men sinners; namely, the law. And now the question arises, How did Christ, or God through Christ, set aside the Mosaic Law? The answer to this appears in a comparison of Gal. iii. 13 with Deut. xxi. 22, 23. Paul says, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us." Had Paul stopped there we would perhaps be warranted in saying that God punished Christ for our sins. But Paul does not stop. He continues quoting the passage from Deuteronomy, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." So, then, Christ is not crucified because he is cursed, because he has the sins of the world to bear. But he is cursed because he, though innocent, yea, even sinless, has been crucified and hung to a tree, and thereby declared unclean, — so unclean, in fact, that if he is allowed to hang all night thus he will pollute the whole Holy Land. "Thou shalt bury him the same day,"

says the Deuteronomist, "for he that is hanged is a curse of God. Bury him, lest thou defile thy land."[1]

Now, here is an irreconcilable conflict between a law which is in many ways "holy, just, and good," and a man who is "without sin," and yet who, by a providential chain of events, has become a curse in the eye of the law. What is to be the outcome? With whom will the Deity side? For three days, runs the story, the momentous problem remained unsolved. Then, lo, the spirit revives, the letter dies. Christ rose from the dead; the law was crucified. It has been common to appeal to Gal. iii. 13 as the ruling passage in support of the idea that Christ in some way died in our stead. But Paul's context is clearly against all this. Ritschl affirms that passages like Rom. iii. 25 and 2 Cor. v. 21 are figurative, while this is literal, and he repeats on several occasions that there is no hint in this passage of the sacrificial idea.[2] Prof. James Drummond has given expression to a similar idea. Says he, "The curse of the law, valid till then, lost its power by touching one to whom it could have no just application. By the law he was cursed; by the very nature of righteousness and of God he was blessed; and therefore the law was dead." Even more interesting than his own valuable note is Professor Drummond's testimony that the Fathers held this view of the passage before him. Justin Martyr, says he, denied that Christ was a curse of

[1] For the persistence of these ideas in later times, see Tobit i. 7 and ii. 11, *passim*, and the New Testament accounts of the necessity of immediate burial.

[2] Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, SS. 48, 174, 246–263, with which agree Everett's Gospel of Paul, and James Drummond's Galatians, pp. 118, 121.

God; and Theodoret, in a note on Gal. iii. 13, affirmed that Christ "himself accepted the death which according to the law was accursed."

Professor Everett has recently come to the support of this interpretation of the Pauline doctrine in a very readable book upon the "Gospel of Paul." And not far different from this view, if at all, is this remarkable passage in Ballou's "Treatise on the Atonement:"[1] "The literal death of the man, Christ Jesus, is figurative, and all the life we obtain by it is by learning what it represented. The literal body of Jesus represented the whole letter of the law, with all the allegories contained in the word of prophecy. The death of the body of Jesus represented the death and destruction of the letter, when the spirit comes forth bursting the veil thereof, which is represented by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead."

19. That this interpretation of the passage is the correct one is further shown by the fact that in Col. ii. Paul closely connects the ideas of forgiveness of sins and freedom from details of the law.[2] In other words, their sins have been forgiven, not because the demands of the law have been satisfied, but because the law itself has been abrogated. Further confirmation comes from the fact that the Gospel tradition represents Jesus as taking great liberties with the law. He broke the Sabbath, and openly combated the "Mosaic" practice of giving *qorban*. How then could such an one by being slain satisfy the law, the just suffering for the unjust? Indeed, Christ cannot be called a sacrifice, except by figure of speech, for there was no altar and no priest on

[1] Miner's Edition, p. 167. [2] Everett's Paul, 160, 162.

Calvary. His death, however, did bring forgiveness and reconciliation, hence the idea that he was a sin-offering or a guilt-offering might easily arise. Yet how loosely that idea was held appears from Heb. ix. 13–15, where Christ's blood cleanses not from sin, but from the dead formalisms of the law, and restores the living worship of God.[1] In fact, it is readily seen, that, if Christ suffered in accordance with the law and to satisfy its demands, then the Mosaic law, ritual and all, must still hold good. The epistle of James seems to see and adopt this conclusion.

20. That the New Testament, as a whole, does not adopt the view that Jesus was a literal sacrifice is obvious from the fact that Jesus is variously spoken of as our ransom, expiation, passover, sin-offering, prophet, and high-priest. To try to get substitutionary or expiatory atonement out of such a diversity of figures is, as Ballou says, "carnality and carnal-mindedness." But inasmuch as the law was the mediator of righteousness to the Jew, Christ, as the destroyer of Jewish particularism, naturally became in a special sense the mediator of the Gentile. This appears clearly in Paul's context, and so confirms our interpretation. Christ was made a curse, "that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham." [2]

21. Now, this "blessing of Abraham," of which Paul speaks, is exactly the prophetic idea of atonement. It is confidence in the ideal man, faith in the final realization of the possible man. The law, says Paul, could not secure this. It bound man down to hard and fast rules. "It was weak through the flesh." It was ne-

[1] Everett's Paul, 169, 170. [2] Gal. ii. 14.

cessary; it had a real and important work to perform. But it was purely transitory, it was a side issue. To use Paul's own language, νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν.[1] Paul is right here; for the story of Abraham, to which he appeals, has come down to us from the classic period of Hebrew prophecy, and precedes the law. It must have been composed not far from the times in which lived the four great prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. The doctrines taught in this charming bit of story are the doctrines of the prophets. Paul, then, by his own confession, carries his doctrines back to the prophets. The mediating priest is set aside. Every man has access to God. The heavenly Father is beforehand favorable to every penitent. They who have faith in Jesus, as the divinely appointed abrogator of ceremonial law, have immediate access to God, and may receive the adoption of sons. Jesus often called himself "Son of man," less often "Son of God." Paul claims this divine brotherhood and sonship for all Jesus' followers. And they possess it in virtue of the fact that Christ is formed within them. The law of God, full of sweet and reasonable morality, is written on the fleshly tablets of their hearts. Each man is a law to himself, and the bond of union is the Christ-ideal.

22. This view of Paul's doctrine of the person and work of Christ finds support in a very large percentage of the early Christian literature. The Gospels lay chief stress upon the works and teachings of Christ. If Paul's doctrines had been taken in the sense that Christ was punished for our sins, it is probable that our Gospels would have been deeply colored with

[1] Rom. v. 20.

that thought. The fact that they are not so colored argues that Paul was not so understood.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which was the catechism of the early Christian churches, clearly supports the above interpretation. The ethical part of the document is very simple, though complete. The prayer recommended is the Lord's Prayer, which is to be said thrice daily. Faith is exalted a spiritual insight into divine things, and into a mystic union with Jesus who is called not God, but a "servant of God."[1]

Equally worthy of comment were the ideas of sacrifice common among the early Christians. If any of them held to a substitutionary doctrine of atonement, he must have created the same *de novo*. For all through the early Fathers the idea of sacrifice prevails, which is expressed in the following quotation from the epistle of Diognetus (150 A.D.). "Whereas the Greeks, by offering these things to senseless and deaf images, make an exhibition of stupidity, the Jews, considering that they are presenting them to God, as if he were in need of them, ought in all reason to count it folly, and not religious worship. For he that made heaven and earth . . . cannot himself need any of these things which he himself supplieth."[2] Obviously here the sacrificial victim is not something which is punished for man as a satisfaction for sin. It is merely a free gift, an offering to the Deity to please him.

23. I have hinted at Hosea Ballou's prophetic insight in apprehending before his time some of the ideas that the Higher Criticism and modern historical investigation generally, have made commonplaces. When he

[1] Greek *παῖς*. [2] Quoted by Prof. Everett, Paul, p. 60.

affirms that the Gospel is but the spirit of ancient Prophetism set free, or as Joel would say, 'poured out upon all flesh, he has done all in his power to approve the thesis of our title, "Back to the Old Testament." Ballou never tires of saying that God's attitude toward man is that of tender love, now and always. And man has only to realize by faith this truth, which Jesus' teachings, life, death, and resurrection reveal, in order to have free access to the heavenly Father. The reason men had resort to sacrifices and penances was because they thought God was angry and needed to be appeased. "As if," says Ballou, "he who commands us to love our enemies could hate or be angry with any man!"[1] "God never called for a sacrifice to reconcile himself to man."[2]

In what sense, then, is Christ a Saviour, according to Ballou? His reply shall be our reply. It is the only one that will suit our argument. Jesus saves because he "has power to cause us to love holiness and hate sin. He has power to reveal the divine beauties of the world; to remove the letter and its administration, which are death, to take the veil from the heart, and to cause us to see himself altogether lovely."[3] Now, this is, I maintain, the teaching of the prophets, sages, and poets of the Old Testament, and it is not contradicted by the law, when we understand the doctrine of sacrifices in its entire history. Christianity joins itself directly to Prophetism as its completion and fulfilment. The ancient Jews said the law is the body, the prophets are the soul. We say the body dies, but the soul lives on forever.

[1] P. 151. [2] P. 147. [3] P. 165.

CHAPTER VII.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE SUFFERING CHRIST.

"The children of the world are members one of another. When the Holy One desires to give healing to the world, he smites one just man amongst them, and for his sake heals all the rest. Whence do we learn this? From the saying, 'He was wounded for our transgressions.'"

TALMUD.

"Not by breaking from the community was the individual to realize himself, but by taking it to his heart, by feeling its sorrows and its sins, as if they were his own, and by sharing its misery, and even its punishment from God."

G. A. SMITH.

CHAPTER VII.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE SUFFERING CHRIST.

I. THE SOCIAL VIEW OF ATONEMENT ACCORDING TO 2 ISAIAH.

1. That the sacrifice of a human victim has supreme power to win the favor or avert the disfavor of a deity, is an idea widely prevalent in primitive society. The practice of offering human sacrifices has been, in times past, well-nigh universal. There are several passages in the Old Testament which indicate that this was, at one time, an orthodox Hebrew practice. It is probable that we have relics of it in the expression "before Jahveh," that occurs in the account of the murder of Agag by Samuel, and in the story of the hanging up, before Jahveh at Gibeah, of the relatives of Saul. Still clearer are the large number of passages in which it is said that a man is made "to pass through the fire." In some of these it is stated that the victim passed through the fire to Moloch. But others make no such limitation; and Jahveh, who was a consuming fire, and whose original abode was the lightning-capped Sinai, was equally conceived, by some Israelites, to be a God who could be appeased by the burning before him of a human sacrifice.[1] Ahaz and Manasseh are both said,

[1] See especially Deut. xii. 30, 31.

by the Book of Kings, to have sacrificed their sons. Jeremiah and Ezekiel both knew of the practice, and condemned it; and Josiah sought to root out this relic of barbarism entirely.[1] One of the most interesting passages bearing upon this question, is found in 1 Kings xvi. 34, where an account is given of the rebuilding of Jericho. The founding of a city was, in early times, an event of great importance.[2] The city, as a whole, must, by some rite or ceremony, be dedicated to a god, or must purchase his protecting favor. Hiel, the Bethelite, when he rebuilt Jericho, sacrificed a son at the laying of the foundation, and another son when he set up the gates. The original purport of the passage is partly obscured by the prophecy of the events in Josh. vi. 26, where a curse is pronounced upon the man who shall rebuild the city. But the original meaning of the passage in Kings is perfectly clear. And it is, obviously, the intention of both passages to censure the practice of human sacrifice.[3] So, too, the famous chapter of the sacrifice of Isaac in Gen. xxii. is clearly intended to show that human sacrifices are no longer pleasing to Jahveh.[4] The implica-

[1] Cf. 2 Kings xvi. 3; xvii. 17; xxi. 6; xxiii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 25; Ezek. xx. 26, 31. The practice is condemned in Deut. xviii. 10; Lev. xviii. 21. The early passage condemns it as a corrupt form of Jahveh worship; the later one, as a form of idolatry.

[2] Coulanges' Ancient City, p. 177 fol.

[3] Dillmann regards this view "an unfounded conjecture," and cites, from classic history, proof that it was a cursed thing to build waste cities. Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua, S. 466.

[4] Says Professor Kuenen in his Hexateuch, p. 244: "Gen. xxii. shows how Elohim, though having the right to demand the sacrifice of children, does not actually require it, but is content with the willingness to make it."

tions of the Hebrew law agree with the histories in this regard. Originally all first-born belonged to Jahveh. And the firstlings of flock, and field were sacrificed. But already in the oldest law human sacrifice is tacitly condemned. It is said that the first-born sons are Jahveh's, but his not to be offered in sacrifice, but to minister to him as priests. And when the Levites took the place of the first-born they were bought off (redeemed) from this service.[1] And if, indeed, sacrifice goes back for its origin to the times of totemism, when the sacrificial animal was really looked upon as a sacred animal, if not, indeed, as a fellow tribesman, we can see how the substitution of the totem animal for the first-born might have appeared a perfectly valid exchange.

2. As time went on, however, it became apparent that neither human nor animal sacrifices gave expression to the highest truths of ethics and religion. It was inevitable that the Jews would come to see that bloody sacrifices were not in accord with either pure worship or good morals; that only a depraved conscience could think of offering a bull or goat, or even the fruit of the body, for the sin of the soul.[2] Yet, on closer reflection, it must have appeared that the real essential truth in the sacrificial idea found its fullest expression in human sacrifice, when correctly understood. And, in fact, the true idea which underlay this notion survived and found expression in a large number of passages. It consists in the belief that the

[1] See the Little Book of the Covenant, Ex. xxxiv. 20, the Book of the Covenant, Ex. xxii. 29, and the Deuteronomic section, Ex. xiii. 1, 2 fol.

[2] Mic. vi. 6–8.

righteous men in a community possess the power to atone for sin and avert evil. This notion does not connect itself directly with that of human sacrifice. Never in the early literature, at least, are the righteous spoken of as a sacrifice. The idea is rather based upon the primitive conception of the oneness of the tribe or nation.[1] Just as the sin of Achan brings its evil consequences upon the whole people, and even, when he is detected, results in the death of his wife, children, and animals, so a few righteous men might, on a similar conception of society, avert a threatened evil. Abraham finally succeeds in obtaining from Jahveh the promise that, if there are ten righteous men in Sodom, he will "not destroy the city for the ten's sake."[2] This same idea finds expression in a well-known passage in Ezekiel, wherein he says, "When a land sinneth against me by committing a trespass, and I stretch out mine hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof, and send famine upon it, and cut off from it man and beast; though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith Jahveh God."[3] A few verses later Ezekiel states explicitly that these men could deliver neither son nor daughter. The family is no longer, as in the story of Achan, a social unit. Jeremiah, too, has a passage which is similar to that in Ezekiel. Jahveh says, "Though

[1] Josh. vii. and Num. xvi. 1–35; 2 Sam. xxiv; 2 Kings xxiii. 26, and often.

[2] Gen. xviii. 16–33. Isaiah gives expression to the same idea, and with the same event in mind, in i. 9, a fact which runs counter to the late date assigned to the Genesis passage by Smend.

[3] Ezek. xiv. 13, 14.

Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people" (xv. 1). And on several occasions Jeremiah affirms that the prayers of righteous men will not avail to avert the coming disaster (vii. 16; xi. 14). In none of these passages is it implied that the righteous suffer for the wicked, or even with them. The passage in Ezekiel, indeed, explicitly states that the three will save their own lives. The righteous, then, in these passages, do not save the people by suffering for them, but by living among them.[1]

In a different series of passages, however, Jeremiah, while not forsaking his position as a mild individualist, affirms that he himself, though righteous, must with his nation take the consequences of a sinful life. The punishment which they have incurred falls with especial force upon him. "The way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (x. 23). These steps are directed by Jahveh, or, rather, they are directed by the corporate life of the nation, of which each separate man is a part. While, then, Jeremiah's theology leads him to expect that the righteous may save themselves, his own experience was to the effect that the good and the bad suffer together for the sins of the bad. Ezekiel, too, for all his reiteration of the doctrine that the soul that sinneth, not some other, shall die for its sins, still regards nations as units, and forces every patriot to take his country's fate. Even in Sheol the peoples are arranged according to their nationality.[2] There is an unseen conflict here. And,

[1] This is the idea that underlies the College Settlements in our day.

[2] Ezek. xxxii. 17 fol.

obviously, the new individualism must produce, in turn, a new and more perfect conception of solidarity. Two of the greatest Hebrews of antiquity, but whose names are unknown, wrestled with this problem. The author of Job is sure that righteousness does not always, and at once, result in happiness and prosperity. The Second Isaiah is sure that the righteous suffer with and for the wicked. They are, as it were, a guilt-offering to Jahveh for the sins of their people. While, then, the time-solidarity (heredity) is declared insufficient to explain this momentous problem of evil, it is tacitly affirmed that the space-solidarity (socialism) is able to throw a new light upon the subject.

3. The Book of Deuteronomy had brought the older thought to a focus, and stated categorically that righteousness and happiness are coextensive. If a man is righteous he will be prosperous and happy, if he is wicked he will be unfortunate and unhappy. Conversely, he who suffers misfortune must either in himself or in his parents be a sinner.[1] This is similarly the point of view of Job's friends, and against which the patriarch so nobly rebels. Now, the Second Isaiah accepted in part and rejected in part the current philosophy. He denied, as did the author of Job, that in every individual case prosperity follows equity. But he affirmed that in the nation as a whole, righteousness and blessing, wickedness and cursing, do balance each other. What had manifestly proved itself untrue in many individual cases was true of the community, the nation, and the world. Said the champions of the new solidarity, "Blessed is the nation that fears the Lord."

[1] See Deut. xxviii.

In a sense all this was but a return to an older view. But it was that older, childlike view lifted into self-consciousness. A truth, which at first had been seen only on its physical side, was now seen on its moral and spiritual side. The doctrine of the equivalence of righteousness and blessing assumed, through the insight into human sympathy, a new and mighty spiritual significance. According to the Babylonian Isaiah, not only is it to be frankly admitted, then, that the righteous suffer, but it is equally true that they suffer willingly. Their sufferings are for a purpose, they are vicarious; that is, they suffer to redeem Israel and the whole world, and bring them to God.[1] Israel was slow to recognize this great mission which the prophet saw for him. The nation was prone to underestimate its great prophets and statesmen. And, on the other hand, these saints often felt that they were not appreciated, either by their fellows or their Deity. But the Great Unknown has a word of momentous consequence for them.

When, because of his disasters, and from a consciousness of his sins, Israel says, "I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nought and vanity," Jahveh says in reply, "It is too light a thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may be unto the end of the earth."[2] This is indeed a

[1] With the idea that righteousness and happiness balance not in the nation simply but in the whole world, as Isaiah's thought really implies, Carlyle could have agreed. Says he, "There is not a red Indian hunting by Lake Winnipic can quarrel with his squaw, but the whole world must smart for it." — SARTOR RESARTUS.

[2] Isa. xlix. 1–6.

remarkable passage. It seems to "point, as it were, beyond the borders of the Israelitish religion."[1] It contains the germs of Christianity and of the absolute religion, the universal religion.

4. Who, then, is it, that according to Second Isaiah, makes this atonement for Israel's sins? Just who or what is this servant of Jahveh, mentioned so often by the prophet? The term is often used in the Old Testament. It is employed in Job i. 8; ii. 3, where perhaps the patriarch is thought of as a symbol of the afflicted nation. Proselytes are also called servants of Jahveh, but the term is most often used of the prophets. There has been much controversy as to the real meaning of Isa. liii. Because of the New Testament use of it, it has been held to be a Messianic section, giving a clear and concise prediction of the work and atoning death of Jesus. This view has now very generally been abandoned, or it is held, if at all, in a greatly modified form. The difficulties in the way of the old interpretation are insuperable. On the other hand, it has been held that the servant is either the whole nation, viewed as an organic unit, or at any rate, the righteous part of it so regarded.

That the Second Isaiah means by the servant of Jahveh the Israelitish nation, or the pious kernel in the nation, and not an individual Messiah, is evident from a number of considerations. Not only does he explicitly call Cyrus the Messiah (xlv. 1), but he just as clearly calls the nation,[2] or the righteous portion of the nation,[3]

[1] Kuenen, Religion of Israel, ii. 138.

[2] Isa. xli. 8; xlii. 1, 18–21; xliv. 1, 2, 21; xlv. 4; xlviii. 20; xlix. 3; with which compare also Jer. xxx. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 25.

[3] Isa. xlix. 1–7; liii. 1–12.

or the prophets of the nation,[1] the servant of Jahveh who makes atonement for the sins of the nation and of the world. This suffering servant cannot have been Christ, for to the prophet he exists in the present and has suffered in the past. According to Wellhausen,[2] the case is put much stronger than this. The nation as a nation has ceased to exist, the servant of Jahveh is dead. But by reason of the atonement made by the nation, there will be a resurrection. He, the nation, shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days. As thus interpreted, the passage makes Second Isaiah look for a renewal of the national life.[3] And this renewal or resurrection of the Jewish state is to be brought about by the teachings and sympathetic and even painful labors of the righteous, who are mediators of God to the people.

If the servant is the whole nation rather than the righteous kernel, then the servant's righteousness is technical rather than real. Indeed, some of the fairest *critics* reconcile these apparently diverse opinions. The prophet seems to think of the term "servant of Jahveh" as applying at one time to the righteous and at another time to the righteous and sinful together. "The truth is," says Piepenbring, "that he gives it by turns to both of them." In more significant language Schultz expresses a similar view. He says the servant "is considered one with empirical Israel in its vocation,

[1] Isa. xliv. 26; xlviii. 16; l. 4–10; lxi. 1–3.

[2] History of Israel, pp. 400, 401. The servant is here identified with the whole people.

[3] Ezekiel's valley of dry bones teaches not the resurrection of individuals, but of the nation (Ezek. xxxvii.).

although distinguished from it in its actual form." The prophet, then, by courtesy identifies with the servant those who are Israelites merely in name. But in his own thought he grants atoning powers only to those who are Israelites in reality. Or, to state the matter differently, the nation was technically just, its civil code was the law of Jahveh, and its religion was the religion of the true God, who was Lord of the whole earth; but, nevertheless, wicked men in the state have brought down the divine wrath. To avert this and save the people, the nation presents itself as a sin offering, which is accepted and the nation is slain. It has gone into captivity and ceased to be. But all this was done for a purpose, to save Israel and the world. The faithfulness of a portion of Israel will prevent God from destroying the wicked who help to compose it (lxv. 8–10). The true Saviour of Israel in any case, then, is its righteous men.

"It is theirs," says Schultz, "by meekness, gentleness, and inexhaustible strength, in the fulness of the spirit and of prophetic eloquence, to make atonement for Israel, to lead him out of prison, to enlighten him, and then to become a light unto the Gentiles."[1]

5. According to liii. 10, the servant is a guilt-offering for sin. As we have already seen in a preceding chapter, the guilt-offering availed only for sins of inadvertence or of perplexity of conscience. Wilful sins or crimes were punished by the civil law; after which the broken and contrite, that is, punished and repentant, spirit might find peace with God. The presenting his soul, then, as an offering for sin is not the most

[1] Schultz, O. T. Theol., vol. i, p. 315.

important part of the servant's work, if we use the word offering in its usual sense. According to 2 Isaiah sin consisted in the intent more than in the act. And it is a question whether he did not believe that animal sacrifice was a superstition which ought in justice to be done away (lviii. 13, 14, lxv., lxvi.). He certainly does not mention circumcision as a requisite to admission into the church (liv. 6–8). At any rate, if we allow Isaiah's book to be the definition of the "guilt-offering," we shall find in it a richness and fulness of meaning found nowhere else. In the Priest Code the *asham* is ethical, but it is not spiritual. In the prophets, poets, and sages, the word often has a transformed meaning, but nowhere so clearly as here are we told what that meaning is. It is here the sacrifice of a guiltless one, to keep the singular, who by voluntarily entering into and bearing the pains of the guilty, puts himself sympathetically into a position to be their true religious teacher and ethical guide.[1] Prof. Cheyne, who, in his commentary on Isaiah, defends the traditional view of chapter liii., practically forsakes his ground when he admits that the *asham* or guilt-offering has efficacy only for him who offers it. Christ, then, could not by offering himself as an *asham* save the world. Only as redeemed and redeemer suffer together, can they hope to be saved together. The servant must be "mystically identified with all Israel," and with the whole world, in fact. For the mission of the servant to the world is clearly emphasized in a number of passages.[2]

[1] Schultz, O. T. Theol., ii. p. 433, note.
[2] xlii. 1–6, xlix. 1–7, liii. 11, 12.

6. Not only does 2 Isaiah spiritualize the idea of sacrifice, but the law also is given a transformed and exalted place. It is interpreted with great freedom, and given a purely spiritual and ethical content. It is identified with the divine and imperishable element in Israel's religious history, it is righteousness and truth, and not legalism nor formalism. The personal element still lives in the law as its vital principle. It is not a mere compend of commands and prohibitions, but it is still one with the prophet who declares it and the God from whom it proceeds. Even when the nation is dead, and the prophetic voice is hushed, the law is the pledge and promise of a resurrected nation. The law is the pedagogue to lead the world to God, but it is also much more than a mere usher, for to 2 Isaiah the law of the Lord finds its fullest expression in the living voice of the Lord's prophets and righteous servants.[1]

7. This servant of Jahveh, therefore, according to 2 Isaiah, may be defined and thought of as possessing the characteristics of a true prophet. He is in every way, by experience and spiritual endowment, fitted and made ready for his arduous task. He is clothed with the spirit of God. His mind and heart are quickened by the divine love. He is made docile and tender. He is made strong and persevering. He knows that he will be despised and rejected, that his own people will fail to appreciate his service, and look upon his work with ingratitude, and even disgust. But he knows also that his preaching is right, and that God is with him. He knows that God must punish, and that he seems to punish in wrath. He knows that his

[1] Isa. xlii. 4, 21; li. 4, 7.

sinful brethren ought to expect wrath and not favor. While, therefore, he receives upon his own shoulders the stripes that have been called forth by others, he does not receive them in wrath or in rebellion, but in sympathy. He feels the wrath of God more keenly than his sin-hardened brothers, but he knows that that wrath is not directed against him. He knows that the father who chastens his child inflicts worse pains upon himself, and that God never punishes willingly. The servant has learned the most important lesson, that, from the very nature of society, good and bad have to rejoice and suffer together to a very large extent. If the noble, the gifted, and the righteous do not take their brothers with them to the summits of the perfect civilization, it is because there is something lacking in their nobility and their righteousness. And so the unknown prophet, at times, seems to censure the servant for want of breadth of view and want of faith, and for seeming lack of success in his mission. Yet the servant makes no complaint. He knows that consciously he has done no wrong. And he submits willingly to his fate, for his presence among those who rebel at the punishment incurred, softens them, melts them to tears, and brings the divine mercy and forgiveness near. By no means does the servant suffer as a substitute for his people. They, too, suffer with him, as he with them. But his suffering with them and sympathy for them, and his constant pleading with them to repent and turn to righteousness, because deserved punishment is the medicine of the soul, places him in the best possible position to be their teacher, and puts them in the best position to learn his lessons.

8. And the better the servant comes to know the people he has saved, the more is he impressed with the fact that they, too, as well as he, have placed their soul as an offering for sin, that they, as well as he, make vicarious atonement for others. After all, that exegesis which sees in Isaiah liii. the whole people, and not the kernel nor a martyr merely, gives the chapter to the world to-day on its richest side. The wicked suffer vicariously as truly as the righteous. And they suffer for the righteous as truly as the righteous do for them. They are forced to bear in their lives the evil results of a form of society which they did not create, but into which they were born as into an inheritance, and from which they could not wholly free themselves. By filling up these gaps they hold society together, and create the environment which makes the righteousness of the righteous possible. If there is one thought above another that dominates the Second Isaiah, it is the thought of the absolute dependence of the members of society upon each other. And in a society in which all are members one of another, any progress that is confined to classes, or cliques, or parties, or denominations, is but make-believe. It is sham progress. And ever and anon he who has pushed his way to the top must turn around, seem to take a backward step, and become the servant of all. He must put his soul an offering for sin. Only thus can society see its seed, and prolong its days. If this is not done ruin and disaster are inevitable. The divinity of the servant, then, consists in the fact, that "he would rather suffer and die than save himself by separating himself from the people, and leaving them without a seed of a nobler future.

Hence this suffering is endured in faith, love, and hope."[1]

The mission of the servant, then, as we have seen, is clearly portrayed in the great unknown prophet; it is to redeem Israel, to make atonement for the sins of the world. The righteous servant "suffers as a part of Israel; he bears the sins of his nation."[2] He does not do this unwillingly, or because forced to it. He does not do it "because of a mysterious decree of God" (Schultz), to purchase salvation or to symbolize Christ, but he does it voluntarily, because he sees that it is his duty and mission.[3] It is not a revealed but a natural duty, one which arises from the very structure of the social organism, for we are members one of another. And may we not agree with John Tillotson, who, in speaking of "a natural duty," continues, "and because it is so it is of a more necessary and indispensable obligation than any positive precept of revealed religion." There is nothing irrational, nothing rationalistic, in this view of atonement. Indeed, it is because it is all so natural, because the mission of the servant was so lofty, broad, and simple, that it never commended itself to the Jews. They were unable to grasp its meaning. A natural and simple, yet profoundly spiritual, view of atonement was not what the Jews or the post apostolic church wanted. And they, therefore, sought to evolve out of this passage something unnatural, irrational, and inhuman, an outrage alike upon God and man.

[1] Schultz, O. T. Theol., vol. i. p. 317.
[2] Kuenen's Religion of Israel, ii. 134.
[3] Isa. xlix. 4–7; l. 5, 6, 10; liii. 1–12.

II. 2 ISAIAH IN THE LATER JEWISH AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

9. Isaiah liii. was not at the outset in any real sense a Messianic passage. The Davidic king did not suffer for his people according to the early prophets or the later psalmists. This is readily admitted to-day by nearly all Biblical scholars.[1] We are explicitly told in the New Testament, in fact, that a crucified Christ was to the Jews a stumbling-block.[2] Josephus and Philo in the time of Jesus had not identified the servant in Isaiah with the Messianic hope. And the Jew, in Justin Martyr's Trypho (150 A.D.), while admitting that the Messiah must suffer, denies that he must suffer death on the cross. It is evident that in the year 25 A.D. no one had thought of, or at any rate emphasized, Isaiah liii. as a Messianic passage. Yet, on the other hand, the opinion that the righteous atone for the sins of the wicked had received a more or less complete development. Aside from that atonement for sin which was brought about by good works, by study of the law, or by prayer, there was believed to be an especial atoning power in suffering and in death. At just what date the Jews made these thoughts a part of their popular religious belief it is impossible to say, but certainly in the time of Christ there was much of this speculation in the air. It was affirmed that complete atonement without suffering is impossible; that

[1] See Toy's Judaism and Christianity, p. 330, note; and also Schürer, ii. 184, for this opinion.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 23.

whoever goes forty days without suffering loses the blessings of the world to come. Sickness atones for lesser sins, for the graver ones death alone can make complete satisfaction. Even for murder, death makes atonement, provided the death sentence be passed by the court, or by the sacred lot; or provided death be voluntarily incurred, or come direct from the Deity, as, for example, by the falling of a tower, or by a thunderbolt. So far one's sufferings and death avail to free his own soul from misery and death in the world to come. Even more striking are the passages in later Jewish writings, in which the righteous make atonement for their less virtuous companions. The ideas of Isaiah liii. are repeated, elaborated, and emphasized. It is affirmed that "our father Abraham could atone for all the follies and lies which Israel shall commit in this world."[1] Moses, it was said, was buried beside the house of Peor, that his grave might atone for the sins of Israel with Baal Peor. On the other hand, one righteous man while living "can still the anger of God over the whole race." This atoning power of the living righteous extends even unto the dead. And, on the other side, children who die in infancy, that is, sinless, have power to atone for the sins of their ungodly parents. A passage which seems to run counter to this circle of ideas affirms that "it is a divine punishment upon the wicked when God removes from them the righteous, for now there are none to appease his anger when it grows hot." This passage certainly does not necessarily imply that the righteous must suffer for their people in order to save them. In fact, the thought

[1] Weber's Altsynagogale Theologie, S. 313.

in 2 Isaiah was too spiritual and lofty for the later Jews, and it was only by slow degrees that the early Church obtained possession of its true meaning, a possession which it afterwards buried under a heap of useless dogmas.[1]

10. Neither Jews nor Christians, then, in 35 A.D., were looking for a Messiah who would make atonement for his people. And further, it becomes evident from a study of this passage in the early Christian and later Jewish literature, that the Jews and Christians worked out the Messianic signification of this passage together. Let us look at the converging lines which at first dimly suggest, and at last enforce, this view of the passage.

Again and again, even in the early literature, it is implied that the road to the Messianic kingdom lies through suffering. The Messiah cannot come until the people repent and turn to righteousness. But to Micah and to Jeremiah the sins of the people appear so deep and vile, that restoration is impossible without the death, that is, the captivity, of the nation. Punishment must precede forgiveness and blessing. What is here said of the people is said of the anointed of Jahveh in some of the Psalms and later prophets. According to Zech. ix. 9, the Messiah is just and saved, but he is also lowly or afflicted.[2] And Zech. xii. 10 seems to speak of the murder of an anointed king from whom the people had expected great blessings. Doubtless, earlier than this, and perhaps just prior to Nehe-

[1] Cf. Prov. xxi. 18, where the wicked are a ransom for the righteous.

[2] The same root is employed which occurs in Isa. liii. 4, "stricken, smitten of God and afflicted."

miah's visit to Jerusalem in 444, the Twenty-second Psalm, entitled a Psalm of David, gave a vivid description of the afflictions of the Lord's anointed. The Messianic king cries out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Only after the fall of the royal house and the ruin of the nation could a temple poet put into the mouth of David the words of Psalm Twenty-two. The Messiah is there made to say,[1]—

> "But I am a worm and no man;
> A reproach of men and despised of the people.
> All they that see me laugh me to scorn;
> They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying,
> He trusted Jahveh that he would deliver him;
> Let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him."

Here it is plainly taught that the Messiah suffers with his people. He does not suffer for them, but he suffers with them. And he encourages them with the thought that Jahveh has not cast them off forever.

> "He hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted;
> Neither hath he hid his face from him."

Not only is the Messiah to suffer with his people, according to the Psalmist, but in a later Psalm[2] than that just quoted, the David whose afflictions have been so great is called the Lord's Servant. The way seems open now for a running together of the conceptions of the Messiah who suffers, and the servant of Jahveh who makes atonement for the sins of his people. Yet the identification was not made. Nor was it made upon the publication of Psalm Eighty-nine, though this poem

[1] Cheyne's Bampton Lectures for 1889, p. 231.
[2] Psalm cxxxii. Cheyne, op. cit. p. 52.

several times calls David the servant of Jahveh, and describes him and his afflictions in language closely parallel with Isaiah liii.[1] The New Testament takes up this thought, left incomplete in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, in a series of passages in which Jesus is called God's servant.[2] The full significance of these passages has been too often ignored. In the Septuagint translation of 2 Isaiah, the expression "servant of Jahveh" is rendered "child of God" or "child of the Lord."[3] This is in the Greek a very peculiar expression; and we find it in several notable passages in the New Testament, and in the early Christian literature, as for example, the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." In none of these passages is the Messianic dignity of Jesus made prominent, yet he is identified by this expression with him who makes atonement for the world in Isaiah liii.[4]

In fact, the strongest hint towards a union of 2 Isaiah's hope with the Messianic hope, in so far as the latter was spiritual and real, is, as Prof. Mitchell has suggested, to be found in Isaiah's own book. In a notable passage in lv. 3, the prophet unmistakably transfers the Messianic blessings from the family of David to the righteous kernel of the nation.[5]

[1] Compare Psalm lxxxix. 29 with Isa. liii. 10; lxxxix. 38 with liii. 2, 10; lxxxix. 42 with liii. 3; lxxxix. 45 with liii. 8. The Psalm is a peculiar one; lxxxix. 1–37 might have been written when a member of the Davidic dynasty was on the throne. Verses 38–51 imply clearly that there is no longer any anointed of Jahveh, i.e., the Jews have no king.

[2] Greek (παῖς).

[3] Matt. xii. 18.

[4] See Acts iii. 13, R. V. margin, for a list of these passages.

[5] See Schultz, O. T. Theol., vol. ii. 421; and also Psalms cxxix. 1–3; xliv. 17–26; and Psalm lxxiii.

But the pre-Christian Jews could not bring themselves to believe that their Messiah, the anointed of Jahveh, from the old and noble family of David, was to make atonement for their sins by his death. How he could and must suffer with them in their national calamity they were able to see. But that the "Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," they were as slow to learn as were the Master's own disciples.

Nevertheless, in the light of the various connecting links between Isaiah liii. and the Messianic ideas, it has become common to admit that, while Isaiah liii. is not primarily Messianic, yet, the early Church enlarged its meaning in full accord with the laws of historical development.[1] This is doubtless true, and it may even be true that in the time of Christ some Jews fully appreciated the thought of the great prophet. Says Prof. Schultz, "To the saints who saw most deeply into the meaning of Scripture at the time of Christ, this picture of the suffering servant of God necessarily disclosed the innermost secret of the divine ways of salvation."[2] Yet, on the other hand, it must evidently be admitted that the disciples did not fully appreciate the deep spiritual significance of Isaiah liii. till forced to it by the death of the Master.

11. The history of Isaiah liii. in the New Testament, in fact, presents a series of remarkable phenomena in support of this. Nearly the whole of the chapter appears in the New Testament, and some verses several times. This seems to argue that it was a favorite

[1] Cheyne's Commentary on Isaiah, vol. ii. p. 223.
[2] O. T. Theol., vol. ii. p. 430.

chapter and familiar to all. But how often is the subject matter either wholly or in part misunderstood! Matt. viii. 17 quotes the crucial verse, not, however, applying it to the vicarious sufferings of Christ, but to the miraculous cures wrought by him wherein he "took our infirmities and bore our diseases." This is an idea wholly alien to the thought of the Hebrew prophet, and an idea which entirely robs the original of all its ethical and spiritual significance. Just as little does Mark xv. 28 contain evidence of the real meaning of Isaiah liii. But even if it did, the passage lacks manuscript authority, and has dropped out of the Revised Version altogether. Luke xxii. 37 seems at first sight to furnish more satisfactory evidence. The words "he was reckoned with transgressors" are put into Jesus' own mouth. Yet they occur in a very troublesome section, which is peculiar to Luke and at variance with the expressed words of Jesus, and with his doctrine of non-resistance.[1] For this reason, and not because the section contains the quotation from Isaiah, the verses (35–38) have been regarded unauthentic by Schleiermacher, de Wette, Ritschl, Holtzmann, and others.[2]

In Acts viii. 26–40 we are told of the conversion of an Ethiopian eunuch through a conversation with the apostle Philip, which was founded upon Isa. liii. 7, 8. But how Philip treated his text, or in what he found the reference to Christ to consist, we are not told. As the Christian doctrine concerning this passage was

[1] Matt. x. 9; v. 39.

[2] Meyer's Commentary defends the genuineness of the verses, but denies that Jesus intended to say that the words originally applied to himself.

more or less peculiar, we must obviously go elsewhere for the first beginnings of that treatment of it. For in this section the Christian interpretation is already presupposed.[1]

In following this line we seem, in fact, to be on the wrong track, and we must turn aside and seek Jesus' interpretation of Isaiah liii. in those passages in which he refers to his work in language of his own.

12. What, then, was Jesus' own view of the significance of his sufferings and death? This question is not easily answered, for our Gospels were manifestly written after the doctrine of the atonement had been fully developed by Paul. And, seemingly, the Gospels must have been colored here and there by the Pauline interpretation. It is maintained by some scholars, for example, that Jesus, in his teaching, attached no doctrinal significance at all to his coming sufferings and death; that he simply saw that these were inevitable if he would establish his cause among men; that only by proving that he was willing to die for his gospel could he convince men that his gospel was true, and bind them to himself in the bonds of a pure religious fellowship. It is affirmed that Jesus was a true prophet, and that he held the prophetic view of salvation. God is merciful and tender, willing to forgive every soul that comes to him; and he asks neither sacrifice nor offering, but only the broken and contrite heart. If Jesus did not teach such a doctrine of salvation, so these scholars argue, it is clear that many of his parables are but very imperfect similes indeed. Says Dr.

[1] Smend, A. T., Rels. Geschichte, S. 262, N. is unfortunate in quoting the passage as a proof of a correct understanding in N. T. of Isaiah liii.

Cone, "Man is represented in the teaching of Jesus as in immediate relations with the Father. The latter needs no propitiation, and for the former no sacrifice is required but that of his selfish passions. The man who would save his life must lose it. No other life is offered up as a substitute for his. . . . In Golgotha there is no substitution. Each soul must pass through it, following the great Leader." [1]

But there is a circle of passages in the synoptic Gospels that seems to run counter to this interpretation. In Mark x. 45, and Matt. xx. 28, Jesus is made to say that he came to "give his life a ransom for many." This passage is cut out of our Gospels by some of the best scholars, as an anticipation of Paulinism, and on the ground that it is incongruous with Jesus' own teaching.[2] Luke, in the parallel passage, and Matthew in a similar context elsewhere, do not give this as the meaning of Jesus' life of self-sacrifice.[3] On the other hand, these passages are defended by Wendt, Ritschl, and others, and interpreted strictly in the light of their contexts, and of those ethical ideas of sacrifice which prevailed among the Jews. Ritschl affirms that the Greek word rendered "ransom" goes back to the Hebrew word which means a covering, or "means of protection;" and then he affirms that the phrase "for many" refers to the whole clause, and not to the "ransom" merely. The words, therefore, refer to the willing death of Christ. He yields up his life for many; to prove to them the superiority of the spiritual over

[1] The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations, p. 113.

[2] Toy's Judaism, p. 353. Cone's Interpretations, p. 114.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 11; Luke xxii. 26.

the physical, and to put into practice his own doctrine, that he who would lose his life shall save it.[1] Suffering and death are inevitable, and only as they are borne in patience and hope, are they the soil upon which the true religious life can develop. So, also, Wendt affirms that we must understand this saying of Jesus, not in the light of the later doctrines of Paul, but in the light of Jesus' own utterances; and if so, then the sense must be that he gives his life as a ransom, "that is, as a means whereby he obtains the deliverance of many." Wendt, in fact, affirms that this difficult passage finds its best explanation in the invitation to the toil-worn and heavy laden of Matt. xi. 28–30.[2]

In a different series of passages Jesus is made to speak of his "blood of the covenant which is shed for many." If these passages are genuine, Jesus must have referred to the covenant sacrifice of the Old Testament. But this sacrifice is not for sin; it is merely a symbol which makes the covenant binding.[3] And the reference is, obviously, also, to the new covenant mentioned by Jeremiah, in which formalism is done away, and the law of God is written on the heart.[4]

To return then to those passages in the sayings of Jesus concerning his mission, in the light of which these should be interpreted, we obviously find that, to use the language of one of his sacred biographers, Jesus "grew in knowledge" in this regard, as time

[1] Ritschl's Recht. u. Versöhnung, vol. ii., pp. 69, 73, 85.

[2] Wendt's Teaching of Jesus, vol. ii. pp. 229, 230.

[3] Ex. xxiv. 1–11.

[4] Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, with Mark xiv. 22–24, and parallels; and Heb ix. 15–21. Possibly, indeed, 1 Cor. xi. 24 is the original of these. Wendt's Lehre Jesu, vol. i. p. 344, and Ritschl, op. cit. 167.

passed. His conception of the kingdom of God as spiritual rather than temporal, and the growing opposition of the Pharisees, must have turned his mind to those portions of the Old Testament in which the sufferings of the righteous were portrayed. Already, so early as the temptation period, unless the temptation was a mere farce, Jesus was confronted with most momentous problems. He felt called upon "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." But the Messianic ideas in his age were legion, and, as a rule, they were mercenary, materialistic, and unethical. Those that were popular flattered the popular desires: those that were moral and spiritual were not popular. Which of these various Messianic ideas should he choose? The Pharisaic ideal would bestow upon him "all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of them." And to the church of Christ's time all other Messianic ideas were heresy. This ideal had real attractions, yet Jesus did not choose it, he chose rather to work in natural and spiritual ways. But he foresaw that this meant suffering, persecution, and perhaps death. Great prophets had always suffered persecution from this people. The Old Testament was full of examples of this. And there was one example of a "Servant of Jahveh," who had willingly put his soul as an offering for the sin of his people. Jesus saw that he too must suffer for his people. But when he spoke of the necessity of this to his disciples they were shocked. Peter, in fact, refused to understand. But Jesus insisted that his true followers, like himself, must bear the cross, the symbol of martyrdom. Truth is found only of those who toil for her and suffer for her.

The religious teacher must ransom truth by dying for it, he must redeem it by his life, it costs him his blood. But, after all, it is not truth that he longs for so much as it is souls that shall love it. So he may say he gives his life as a ransom for his fellows, that they may, like him, choose truth, and, at the same time, learn the lesson of human suffering.

In the light of the quotations from Isaiah liii., in the Synoptics, and of Jesus' own view of his sufferings and death, we may rest satisfied in the opinion that there was an old and well-founded tradition that Jesus, in some way, saw that his own life story was told in Isaiah liii. But those who have given us this most interesting bit of information, show us that they themselves did not understand Isaiah liii., nor Jesus' use of it. On the other hand, the sayings of Jesus, as a whole, confirm the belief that he did understand the great Unknown Prophet, and that he applied his thought to himself in a purely rational and deeply spiritual manner. And it is in the Fourth Gospel that we find the highest and most satisfactory confirmation of this opinion.

13. The Gospel of John is permeated through and through with that view of the atoning work of Christ which flows naturally out of 2 Isaiah. It has been often pointed out that John's Gospel lacks entirely the forensic, sacrificial idea of Jesus' death. Says Dr. Cone, with characteristic clearness and force, "He offers no atoning sacrifice, and his death is not an humiliation, but a gateway through which he passes out of the darkened world into his glory. He does not suffer to satisfy the divine righteousness, and does not buy off sinful

men by the payment of the precious ransom of his blood, but he draws them to himself by the attraction of his personality, and to those who receive him he gives power to become the children of God."[1]

The reference in John i. 29 to the "lamb of God that bears away the sin of the world," can hardly be explained of the paschal lamb, as Luther and Reuss have contended. For the blood of the paschal lamb was a mere symbol and had nothing to do with sin. Nor can we agree with Ritschl[2] that the reference is not to Isa. liii. 10, because of the fact that the atonement is for the whole world. For 2 Isaiah clearly gives to the servant a mission to the whole world, and no other sacrifice in the Old Testament, in fact, does possess such universality. Furthermore, the whole picture of the work of Jesus, as contained in the Logia of John, agrees with the ideals of the work of the Servant of Jahveh as given by 2 Isaiah.

With John i. 29 agrees 1 John iii. 5. Several other passages, notably in the writings of Paul and his followers, are possibly references to Isaiah liii. Some of these may be based upon a correct understanding of it; but their first reference seems rather to be to the Levitical sacrifices, or to the prophetical ideas underlying those conceptions.[3] In 1 Peter ii. 20–25, on the other hand, is to be found the most concise and clear, and at the same time most correct, application of the thought of the unknown prophet to the work of Christ to be found anywhere in the New Testament. So significant are

[1] The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations, page 374.
[2] Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, S. 67, 8.
[3] Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 3; Heb. ix. 28; Rev. v. 6.

these words that they fitly appear here as the close of this discussion. Comment upon them is unnecessary. The author says to his readers, "If when ye do well and suffer, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye are healed. For ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls."

III. APPENDIX ON SECOND ISAIAH.

1. Several recent authors incline to the opinion that there are three main authors of Isaiah xl.–lxvi. Second Isaiah wrote chapters xl.–lv., except the sections named below, and lived toward the close of the exile. Later than this the "Servant of Jahveh fragments" were written and based upon 2 Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Job. These are found in xlii. 1–4; xlix. 1–6; l. 4–9; and lii. 13–liii. 12. To 3 Isaiah belong chapters lvi.–lxvi. These three books were put together at a very late date by an editor who made changes in chapters xliv., xlvi., xlviii., and l. 10 fol., bringing them into closer harmony with 3 Isaiah.

Smend has recently (1893) come to the support of Duhm in the main details of this analysis. Certainly the so-called "Servant of Jahveh fragments" hang to-

gether, and are much more pronounced in their universalism than the other parts of Isaiah.

2. From Isa. lii. 13 to liii. 12 we seem to have a dialogue, in which Jahveh, the prophets, and the people are the speakers.

In lii. 13–15 Jahveh calls attention to his servant who is to be exalted and lifted up. In liii. 1–3 the prophets complain that the people have not listened to them; they have not accepted the work of the servant in their behalf. In liii. 4–6 the people admit that the servant has really been smitten for them, and that they are healed with his stripes. Then Jahveh replies in liii. 7–9 that, though they have in a measure recognized his mission, they have not appreciated him. They have made his grave with the wicked and the transgressors. In the remaining verses, 10–12, the author, or Jahveh speaking through him, sums up the results. The servant was made a sin offering. And because he died willingly for his people he shall redeem his people, and have a portion with the great.

Smend thinks the servant was an individual, not the whole people, a sick and persecuted prophet, in fact, "like Jeremiah, but more than he." With the view that the servant was sick agree Duhm and many Jewish and Christian scholars on the most natural rendering of liii. 3. (See Revised Version margin.)

Instead of "rich," in verse 9, most scholars now think we should read "transgressors," a change of a single letter in the Hebrew text. Verse 10 is very perplexing on any hypothesis. Duhm says it is not metrical, as is the rest of the chapter, and accordingly does violence to the text. He cuts out the word *asham*, so that the

servant is no longer a guilt-offering, though he does, according to Duhm, suffer vicariously for his people.[1]

3. The Jews were not able to understand this chapter. Rashi says that "this prophet speaks constantly of the whole people as one man." But the great majority of the later Jews saw here the example of a suffering righteous man merely, and after the time of Christ, if not before, a reference to the Messiah. The Babylonian Talmud calls the Messiah a leprous or sick one, on the authority of Isaiah liii.

The following selections from the Targum Jonathan, an Aramaic translation of the Bible, show how the later Jews understood the passage. The Targum begins in lii. 13, "Behold my servant Messiah." But by twists and turns the Messiah's sufferings are gotten rid of. The strongest passage is "He will become despised" (liii. 3).

Verse 4. "Then for our sins will he pray, and our iniquities will, for his sake, be forgiven, although we were accounted stricken, smitten from before the Lord and afflicted."

Verse 6. "All we like sheep had been scattered, we had each wandered off on his own way; but it was the Lord's good pleasure to forgive the sins of all of us for his sake. 7. He prayed and he was answered, and ere even he had opened his mouth he was accepted: the mighty of the peoples he will deliver up like a sheep to the slaughter and like a lamb dumb before her shearers; there shall be none before him opening his

[1] Duhm asserts, in fact, that the Hebrew of liii. 10 is absolutely untranslatable. It is worthy of note also that the speaker in 10 is hardly the same as the speaker in 11, 12.

mouth or saying a word. 8. Out of chastisement and punishment he will bring our captives near. . . . 9. He will deliver the wicked into Gehinnom, and those that are rich in possessions into the death of utter destruction. . . . 10. But it is the Lord's good pleasure to try and to purify the remnant of his people, so as to cleanse their souls from sin: these shall look on the kingdom of their Messiah, their sons and their daughters shall be multiplied, they shall prolong their days and those who perform the law of the Lord shall prosper in his good pleasure. . . . 11. By his wisdom he will hold the guiltless free from guilt, in order to bring many unto subjection to the law; and for their sins he will intercede. 12. Then will I divide for him the spoil of many peoples, and the possessions of strong cities shall he divide as prey, because he delivered up his soul to death, and made the rebellious subject to the law."

CHAPTER VIII.

BACK TO BOTH TESTAMENTS FOR THEIR RECONCILIATION

"When, having shown the divergencies, contradictions, and errors in the Bible, we go below the surface to the substance of things, we are obliged to admit that the Bible has not only a human, imperfect, transitory side, but also a divine, perfect, unchangeable, eternal side. Some have wished to see only the former, others only the latter side. To be fully in the right we must recognize that one exists as well as the other."

PIEPENBRING.

CHAPTER VIII.

BACK TO BOTH TESTAMENTS FOR THEIR RECONCILIATION.

1. In the foregoing discussion the Messianic idea, the sacrificial idea, and the suffering servant idea were, by conscious purpose, kept distinct. It was believed that each one of these lines of thought bore fruitage in a New Testament doctrine, which gained in clearness by being kept distinct from the others.

Along three distinct lines, therefore, to set the purely ethical one side, the Old Testament prepared the way for Christ. And along each one of these lines we find a better picture of the work and nature of Christ in the pre-Christian revelation than in the prevailing exegesis of the Church which has dominated the New Testament, and forced the Old into its mould. The Old Testament doctrine of Messiah led the world to expect a Saviour who would be a Saviour in virtue of his spiritual leadership. The doctrine of sacrifice and Paul's treatment of it represents Jesus as a Saviour, because he has by his death on the cross forever done away with all arbitrary and fictitious barriers which men have thought separated them from God, and by his work among men as Son of God he has shown that as he, so God cares more for sincerity and uprightness than for sacrifices. Lastly, the Old Testament idea of the suffering righteous, who suffer with and for

their people, and the later Jewish notion of the One servant of God in particular, who is regarded as a sin-offering, set before us the doctrine of vicarious atonement in a way at once so profound, so natural, and so rational, that no one can reject it; an idea which comes to our own age with trenchant force. Here we are led to expect a Saviour who suffers and dies with and for his people, who gives up his life that men may take his truth and live. The New Testament, interpreted in the light of the Old, comes to our age with a Christ touched with a feeling of our infirmities; with a Christ who is most truly divine, because most truly human; who is most truly Saviour, because he was most truly unselfish.

2. Yet the question will arise, and it deserves an answer, whether Jesus was in reality the Messiah, the Christ of God, in whose very person the two Testaments are locked together.

There is certainly a tendency among liberals to-day to discard more and more the use of the title which the early Church gave to Jesus. It is argued with much learning and much justice that the Messiah of the Jew, the Messiah foretold in his sacred Scriptures, has not yet come. The Reform Jews have ceased to expect such Messiah, and the Orthodox Jews, with much show of reason, stoutly deny that Jesus of Nazareth can lay any claim to such title.

If we turn to the New Testament for help in the solution of the problem, we seem to get little satisfaction. We are given results, but not the processes that led to them. Or, rather, we cannot but note many missing links between an Old Testament prophecy and

its purported New Testament fulfilment. On the basis of the Gospel tradition alone there is some ground for the supposition that the claim to Messianic dignity was an after-thought of Jesus, — that he was drawn into it by the enthusiasm of his followers, while it was his own purpose to make no such claims. However that may be, it is manifest that the whole apostolic doctrine is built upon the belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah. If Jesus was not such Messiah, Christianity was misnamed, and Jesus ought not to be forced to wear a title which he does not desire, and which mocks history. Professor Pfleiderer, in his account of the conversion of Paul, intimates that when it was suggested that Jesus was the fulfilment of one and another of the prophecies, long supposed to be Messianic, Paul would have no means of refuting the claim. At any rate, Paul did not refute the claim. And in Pauline theology the whole Old Testament looks forward to Christ. "All God's promises are yea and amen in Christ Jesus." The whole apostolic theology falls if Jesus is not Christ.

3. Rash and fantastic claims on the part of many have caused some very broad statements to be made within the limits of the Orthodox churches. Dr. Briggs has given up many prophecies long counted as Messianic, and the others he has interpreted in such a way as to very materially change the picture of the Messiah presented. Hengstenberg, Oehler, Riehm, and Westcott admit that often there is a wide gap between the intention of the original writer and the New Testament application of his words. Nitzsch laid it down as a rule that a prophecy must not foretell the future

accurately; it would upset human affairs, paralyze effort, and introduce iron-bound necessity where freedom reigns. So, then, "prediction must not disturb history." Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Tholuck accept this rule. So also does Kueper. And he is at great pains to prove that the prophecies did not meet with exact fulfilment. Modern criticism places the date of the Book of Daniel subsequent to the events it narrates, and admits its historical accuracy. Kueper says it was written before the events it describes, and, bound by his rule, goes to great lengths to prove that it was not literally fulfilled. Such are some of the eccentricities into which an effort to defend a certain kind of predictive prophecy has betrayed scholars who, in every other respect, show that they are in their right mind. It has been asked whether Professor Briggs is speaking seriously when he mentions three phases of prophecy, — the dream, the vision or ecstatic state, and the enlightened spiritual discernment. Evidently he is, and does believe that God spoke to men in dreams. Neither would he admit, with David Hume, that this is the same as for the same men to dream that God spoke to them.

The failure of all these scholars to find a method of defence that attacks the problem seriously, and establishes the desired thesis conclusively, is shown by the ever recurring confession that a new discussion is necessary.

The questions that arise and ask a settlement are legion. What is the relation of Old Testament to New? How far does prophecy anticipate the gospel? To what extent, or in what sense, if at all, was Jesus

conscious of his Messiahship? Making due allowance for the subjective element, had God's dealings with Israel a definite end, and was that end Jesus Christ? In the light of a broad, free survey of the history, did or did not God's dealings with Israel find a *raison d'être* in their own environment? The problem is more than half solved when we have succeeded in asking the right questions.

4. Again, if we would not be misled, we must examine each prophecy in the light of its own age, as well as in the light of its fulfilment. Kuenen has done this, and concludes that "the New Testament Christ is another than the Messiah of the Old Testament." Professor Briggs has been over the same ground, has studied the same prophecies, and these are his words: "Hebrew prophecy springs from divinity as its source and ever-flowing inspiration, and it points to divinity as its fruition and complete realization. None but God could give such prophecy; none but God can fulfil such prophecy. The ideal of prophecy and the real of history correspond in Him who is above the limits of time and space and circumstance, who is the Creator, Ruler, and Saviour of the world." Again he says, "In Jesus of Nazareth the key of the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament has been found. All its phases find their realization in his unique personality."

The method must, to a certain extent, account for these divergent conclusions. Left to the Old Testament alone, and with no "stream of tendency" behind us, we would inevitably reach Kuenen's conclusions. Adopting the method of Professor Briggs, and being favorably inclined towards the opinions of the New

Testament writers, the opposite conclusions would, no doubt, be the more natural. But, as Dr. Riehm has pointed out, this method is, in a measure, a false one. To start out with our eye upon the goal means that we will see the goal and nothing else. We will have a feeling or a very imperfect knowledge of the ground we are on, and a very vivid picture of the end aimed at. If the question is raised, "What did the Holy Spirit mean by this prediction?" the answer comes, "Go to the fulfilment and see." Such a method cannot be the true one. The most that it can reveal to us is the *relation* of prophecy to its fulfilment. "What we do not learn until the fulfilment cannot be in the prophecy itself." Only when prophecy and history are kept distinct, and studied with relation to their own environment, can sure results be obtained. We have no right to read into a prophecy what we find only in the fulfilment.

Suppose, then, an impartial criticism decides that Jesus is not the Messiah of the Jews, shall we give up the word Christ, or spell it with a small c as Westcott and Hort do the Greek word in their edition of the New Testament? Shall we give up the word Christian and call ourselves by some other name? Assuredly, No. And for two reasons.

6. In the first place, no idea, and no word as the symbol of an idea, is given up by one generation to another in the same form in which it was received. Some ideas are purified gradually, while the symbol remains the same. "Spirit," meaning originally wind, illustrates the point. Other ideas have had a birth in the memory of man and yet demanded new sym-

bols, or old ideas have grown too large to be embodied in a single word and have split asunder. So long as a word has content it remains. Nor does the fact that it originated in false notions compel us to discard it. If we turn to the process of word-making, we discover that words are not created *de novo*, but old words are taken up, rechristened and rehabilitated, and given back to the world. From an ideal point of view it was especially fitting that Jesus should be called Christ. If, on the one hand, his personality purified the conception of Messiah, the popular enthusiasm for an expected deliverer, in its turn, assisted his teachings to win the recipient hearts of his fellows in a way that they could not otherwise have done. So, then, J. H. Crooker may say, with truth, that, "although Jesus was not such a Messiah as the prophets described, nor as the Jews expected, yet this general Messianic expectation did much to shape his ministry and clothe his person with authority. Every great character must work in connection with some great sentiment. Every great leader must somehow enter into and possess the popular imagination."

7. That this claim of Jesus to the title of Christ is not founded upon a mere sentimental idealism, is shown by another consideration, which those who oppose his Messiahship are too prone to ignore. The later prophets themselves see that the earlier Messianic ideas cannot meet with a literal fulfilment, that the national existence must come to an end, that a spiritual Israel will take the place of the temporal Israel, and that God will make a new covenant with his people and *write* his law on their heart. The temple service will

pass away. The theocracy, as it was understood in the former age, will be forgotten. This new covenant will be an everlasting covenant.[1] To be sure, following these annunciations, are predictions of the Messiah as faulty as any. But the reason is obvious. While the prophet promises a new covenant, he continues to write and think in the categories of the old. It could not be otherwise. It is not his description of the new order, but his promise of it, which is significant. One consideration which has helped to blind the Christian world to this fact, is the name that was given to the New Testament. It should have been called the New Covenant. While those under the New Covenant are not warranted in making the Messianic prophecies mean to their contemporaries anything more than the obvious sense of the words will allow, they have a right to demand that the new covenant there promised shall reflect its light backwards upon them and illuminate them. The writer of Hebrews voiced one of the sublimest truths of history when he proclaimed that "they without us could not be made perfect." Had the Old Covenant made no promise of a New, a failure of Jesus to realize the Jewish ideal of Messiah would deprive him of a just right to the title of Christ. But the promise of a new covenant, placing religion upon a higher basis, must of necessity render the old ideals valueless as literal representations. If Jesus sustains the same relations to the New Covenant as the ideal of the Messiah did to the Old, then Jesus is the Christ of God.

8. For the moment, then, I purposely reverse the

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31–34.

thesis which this book was written to prove. I set out to show that one must go to the Old Testament to understand, in all their richness and freedom, in all their lengths and breadths, heights and depths, the teachings of Jesus and his apostles. I conclude with the opinion, equally well established by the facts, as it seems, that only a Christian can understand the Old Testament; that only he who has profited by the Christian revelation can read between the lines with sufficient inerrancy to discern God's sublime plans in the Hebrew history. Despite the sublimity of the God of the Jewish people, their whole religion aimed to bring God and man near to each other. And that goal was reached when Christ took upon himself for our sakes the form of sinful flesh, and by righteousness and by communion with God overcame the flesh and death, and brought life and immortality to light. The Christ took upon himself, or took to his heart, the sorrows and sins of the whole world, as if they were his own. He shared, by sympathy and actual suffering, the world's misery, and even its punishment. And by this he showed us that the deepest and truest feeling of all religion is the feeling of solidarity and sympathy, — the vicarious conscience and heart and life!

CHAPTER IX.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS SOCIOLOGY.

"To check the enormous waste of resources, to calm the rhythmic billows of action and reaction, to secure rational adaptation of means to remote ends, to prevent natural forces from clashing with human feeling, to turn physical phenomena to human advantage, these are some of the aims of sociology."

LESTER F. WARD.

CHAPTER IX.

BACK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ITS SOCIOLOGY.

1. ONE reason why sociology is coming to have so absorbing an interest for the educator, the philanthropist, and the churchman, is the fact that science, ethics, and religion are coming to be recognized as co-ordinate fields of human endeavor, each of which is a *sine qua non* of progress. Each one is but a branch of the greater science of humanity. The religious teacher, who is inclined to be fair, is forced to admit that religion cannot be legitimately defined, so as to include all the forces that make for progress. He can be shown men who are very religious, and yet who are without interest in things intellectual, and without high ethical motive. The educator, in proportion to the breadth of his culture, is wont to admit that his calling places an undue emphasis upon the head, and that he cannot predict the future till the heart is trained also. The ethical culturist may include social ethics, and yet leave something out of his science that he ought to put into the man. The merely moral man is not a lovable man. Just as man has intellect, feelings, and will, all of which should be trained, so society has, roughly speaking, science, religion, and business; and it is only when these exist in their true relations, that we have a perfect society. Just as intellect, feel-

ing, and will merge into each other by imperceptible gradations, so that it is only by a violent process of dissection that we can handle them separately; so the faculties of society are similarly bound together. Literature may be science, it may be religion, it may be business. The creation of literature may also be classed in either of these three categories.

2. Sociology is the science that co-ordinates all the special social sciences, and it finds its right to be in the fact that true progress cannot be measured by the advance in any one branch of society. Just as an age of religious revivals may be an age of weak morals, so an age of irreligion may be an age of great mechanical progress. The mechanical progress may, in turn, usher in, or aid in ushering in, a better religion, and so on. How to introduce harmony into the working of these various forces, how to prevent the unnecessary clashing of interests, and lessen the zigzag of our onward march, are some of the age-wide aims of the social philosophers. That a panacea has been discovered is not claimed. The social scientists, like the physical scientists, are not altogether agreed among themselves. But upon one thing they are agreed, and that is, that the new science contains more of the elements of progress than any other, and in a better order for the performance of the work of him who would reform society.

3. Especially is it true that the Scriptures have been narrowed in their usefulness from being studied so exclusively on the side of their religion. Of supreme value to us all is the religion of the Bible. Against it I make no charge. But what I here affirm is this, that

there are other essentials to our soul's salvation besides religion. Religion, especially the Biblical religion, presupposes a mind capable of intelligent judgment and choice, it presupposes a heart capable of deep and constant affection, it presupposes a life-aim, a chosen vocation filled with its daily duties. Are we born into all these, ready made? Not by any means! Yet religion is as dependent upon these as they are upon religion. As Mr. Lecky has somewhere said, "It is impossible to lay down a railway without creating an intellectual influence. It is probable that Watt and Stephenson will eventually modify the opinions of mankind almost as profoundly as Luther and Voltaire." Now, the Bible recognizes the truth of this solidarity of progress that Mr. Lecky has here so forcibly depicted. Especially is this true of the earlier Biblical books, those that were written before the distinction between sacred and profane, religious and secular, had arisen; and those later books that outline and emphasize the functions of the church-state presuppose an essential oneness of these institutions. The New Testament aims not at the salvation of individual souls merely, but at the perfect society. It applies to this world the best features of the Messianic age of the prophets. All through the Scriptures it is tacitly admitted that religion is but a branch of a wider science, which we to-day call sociology.

4. The study of any ancient society should proceed upon the basis of a careful and accurate understanding of its literature as illustrated in the history of older peoples, the influence upon it of contemporary history at home and abroad, and finally the influence of that

literature upon later generations. This latter point may at first seem unnecessary. But in reality it is not so. Histories, like those of the Hebrews, Greeks, or Romans, have been very potent in all the subsequent progress of civilized peoples. And there is a decided tendency to find in the past the justification for any advance step made by ourselves. Often the past has been misinterpreted in order to furnish this justification. The story of the influence of the Old Testament, for example, upon modern history, is the story of the interpretation of that history in the given time.

Has the Old Testament, with its culmination in the New, anything worthy our heed if we would understand aright the past and future of our social order? As Hebrew history and religion were constructed and construed by the older scholars, they were more unique than helpful. They threw the matter into hopeless perplexity by baffling all attempts at order and growth. God seemed to have no plans himself, and he delighted in setting at naught the plans of his servants. All this has been changed in the last few years. There is a rapidly increasing unanimity among scholars as to the general trend of Hebrew development. As it is reconstructed the Hebrew history becomes the best at hand for the study of the problems raised by the modern social movements.

Of the importance of their contribution to the world's progress the Hebrews were themselves fully aware. How far they looked into the future we cannot say. Neither can we assert that they had any definite idea as to just how their God was to become

the recognized God of the universe. But by an insight, that no merely naturalistic theory of history can explain, they saw the future triumph of their religion and morality.[1] One of the surest signs of genius is the possessor's assurance that he has it. The Hebrew national self-consciousness, and the justification which history accords to this, is the strongest proof of the divine inspiration and mission of this people.

Another reason why Biblical Sociology can lay especial claims upon our attention is the fact that the Bible is a book that is well known. Many influences conspire to hold it in high esteem. It enjoys an authority which in civilized lands no other book enjoys. As such its teachings command attention. Even those who do not appeal to it as authority for themselves continue to use it as an authority for others, because it is considered as such by the people generally. A circumstance that renders the Hebrew people especially interesting to the sociological student is also the fact that we have in them, more than in any other people, a typical history of progress. Those peoples that are constantly suffering national reverses, and, after each of these, readily intermarry with strangers and adopt new and alien forms of thought and worship, baffle us. The new elements upset all our calculations. The very exclusiveness of the Hebrews, which was their weakness in some regards, was their strength in others.

In the Hebrew history, culminating in the New Testament, we have an example of a remarkably pure development of a national idea from within. The ideal

[1] Deut. iv. 8.

of the Israelites was early formed, and the best of them never, amidst all their reverses, wholly abandoned it. This ideal was a growing ideal. And so carefully written is their history that the main details of the progress, and the principle causes of it, are not hid from us, but lie ready to hand. This may now be said without hesitation, though a few years ago it might have been disputed.

5. Before going farther, then, let us give a brief outline of the order in which the various Biblical books should stand, when arranged chronologically. First we have the older narrative portions of the Pentateuch, Judges, and Samuel. Then come the first writing prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah. With Jeremiah should be classed the Book of Deuteronomy, discovered, if not written, in the time of Josiah (622). On the basis of the theological notions of Deuteronomy, Judges, and parts of Samuel and Kings, were rewritten. At the beginning of the exile comes Ezekiel, and at its close the 2 Isaiah. Then follow Zechariah (1-9) and Haggai and the building of the second temple (520). Then Ezra and Nehemiah, and the publication of the completed law (444). Large parts of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, as also portions of Joshua, were now written for the first time. Joel and Job belong after Ezra, and Proverbs and the Psalms received their final form a little later still. Chronicles come about 300, Daniel about 164, and Esther still later perhaps. As thus dated the Hebrew history follows an intelligible course of development. And aside from the large amount of critical, historical, and linguistic evidence in favor of the order is the fact that

there is no Biblical evidence against this view of it. We do not hesitate to set the Jewish tradition aside when it says that Ezekiel was written by the men of the great synagogue; why should we cling to it when it attributes to Moses or Isaiah or Samuel words which they themselves do not pretend to have written?

As thus chronologically arranged, the Bible is the best text-book to be had upon the subject of sociology. To be sure, it needs to be interpreted in the light of the best science of the present, and to appear at its best the Bible must be expounded by a man of the keenest intellect, the purest morals, and the tenderest sentiment. But the Bible deserves to be interpreted by just such men, for these men are directly or indirectly the children of the Book and of its religion. It would be unfair to the Bible to ignore the Christian scholarship which it has aided in producing, and judge it in the light of the error and superstition of the past, thinking to do honor to it by heaping upon it epithets which it never claimed for itself, — epithets which rob it of its sweet humanity, its noble individuality, and its lofty genius. No, it is as interpreted in the light of the Christian freedom and Christian criticism that it has produced, that the Bible is to-day the best text-book on sociology. It is the broadest, most impartial, most fertile in suggestion of all the books. It contains a complete history of an important branch of the race, from the very lowest beginnings to a position of eminence in the civilized world. Minds of varying degrees of insight have struggled to outline for us, in the pages of the Bible, the causes of the successes and reverses of their people. The intensely religious man,

who makes all hinge upon the obedience or disobedience to the divine commands, has his say. But the man of practical wisdom, who takes account of natural causes, and inclines to place the chief stress upon them, is also allowed to speak in the pages of the Bible. The lawyer, who insists upon taking the people no faster than they can go, is there. The Old Testament contains a half-dozen civil codes of growing complexity, each building upon the preceding, casting away what has become useless, adding higher motives to the old commands, and here and there enjoining a new one. We see the priest, who is satisfied if the people pay their dues, and we see by his side him who is truly zealous for the Lord's service. Above all we see the idealist, the preacher of righteousness, the prophet toiling laboriously on, in season and out of season, attacking with vigor whatever has about it the smell of corruption, whether in private life or public, in church or in state, at home or abroad. This same prophet is really the creator of the law, and the reformer of the ritual. It is he who wins for his people an ever truer conception of God; it is he who reveals more keenly the true relations of a man to his neighbor. It is he to whom the Lord speaks, and when God will speak his prophets cannot hold their peace.

Biblical Sociology, then, is sociology *with a soul.* It cannot be a bare natural history of human progress. It is dynamic, as well as static. It is prophetic, as well as historical and critical. It cannot be content with what has been or what is; it is equally concerned with what ought to be. Biblical Sociology sees God in history everywhere, and the highest duty of man is,

accordingly, to become God's co-worker. Therefore, what ought to be, it is man's bounden duty, with God's help, to accomplish.

Biblical Sociology is a wider science than Biblical Theology. Religion itself is a branch of sociology. The Bible takes it for granted that social progress is not altogether conditioned by religious advance. But religious advance is conditioned by the progress of society as a whole. Therefore it is a mistake to confine our study of the Bible to its religion. If we would seek the causes of human progress we must study sociology; and if we desire to know the whole lesson that the Bible has for us, we must study the various phases of social life that the Bible reveals.

6. The Biblical Sociology begins not with man nor with society, but with God and the creation. After the visible creation is complete God continues to work in man. The mere forming of a living being in the human shape is the smallest part of the creation of man. Only by a long course of training is man made in the image of God. The second man is a murderer. Society develops its worst traits first. Thus it appears that the first society was a failure, and a deluge blots it from the face of the earth.

The second trial is more successful. Individual habits multiply and become contagious customs, the frozen deeds of the early race; these introduce uniformity and make progress possible. Ideas of kinship and of kindness bind certain families together, and we have the permanent beginnings of a social order. Natural affection is so extended as to offer the right to live "to all within the tribe." The life of the tribe is a

common possession, and is under the control of a chief or patriarch.

The earliest law is that of retaliation. It declares that eye shall go for eye and life for life. This law checks the rash and the cruel with the fear of death; it inspires the timid with a sense of their duty to themselves and to their brother clansmen.

7. Up to this time there is no man and wife in our sense of the word. The period of infancy of the offspring has held the parents together for a longer or shorter period; but there are no restrictions upon conjugal infidelity. There are relics of pairing seasons, of group marriages, and of polyandry and polygamy. Monogamy is the prevailing form of union, but the evils of the other forms are not recognized.

The male parent not only owns his wife and may sell her at will, but he owns his children, and has the power of life and death over them. The slave is still more absolutely the property of the master, while the laws of hospitality are, on the other hand, exceedingly fraternal.

Gradually all this changes. The family comes to be regarded as a divine institution. The union of one man with one woman, and for life, is clearly seen to be the divine order. Love is recognized as the bond of union, and its everlastingness is beautifully told. Wedded love becomes the symbol of the divine love which was sealed by an everlasting covenant. The husband repudiates the idea of owning his wife. He asks her to call him not "lord (owner)" but "husband." The value of her good name is recognized, and her maternal qualities are duly praised. The child is ruled by love now. Ar-

bitrary law has given way to mutual understanding; force, to persuasion. Fatherhood becomes the synonym of protection, guidance, and kindly counsel. The slave is now the owner of his own body. A master who mutilates the body of his slave has trespassed upon the rights of another; and the slave may demand in damages the price of himself and go free. The slave is also given one rest day out of the seven, and is accorded some of the privileges of the religion.

8. The first government is that of the parent. The father of the family keeps all the younger members with him. The daughters are married into other families, and the sons marry and bring their wives home. The necessity of guarding against wild beasts or hostile tribes keeps the family together. This becomes at last a tribe, and then several tribes unite and a nation or a people is formed. In the tribe the father of the largest family is chief, and the other fathers are elders or advisers. In the federation of tribes the strongest chief becomes the judge or king, and so on. As the society becomes more complex the functions of government multiply. At the outset the judge or king is ruler, priest, and prophet. Later there are recorders, generals, and statesmen, judges, priests, and prophets. Custom is turned into law. The power of the ruler is limited. The influence of the prophet increases. Wars grow less frequent and the soil is more faithfully tilled. Plunder gives way to taxes and tributes.

9. In the early days, land was as free as air, and no one thought of owning it. The land across Jordan and south of the ten and a half tribes belonged to Chemosh. Palestine belonged to Jahveh, and his people shared it

in common. In a desert country the first real property is a well, or cistern. As the people multiply and the shepherd becomes an agriculturist, it is seen that it is best to divide the land among the people. But still the land is cheap, and each man is expected to own a piece of land. So firmly fixed was the idea of man's nearness to the soil, that each man's estate was declared inalienable. Mismanage as he might, he must not be allowed to deprive his children of their patrimony. Unfortunately, however, this law became a dead letter as society became more complex.

10. Labor was dignified in all the Jewish law. Each man had learned a trade while young. Each was able to support himself. The idler was despised. Learned leisure was not thought of. "Labor is happiness," said the Jew, and he proved his words. The nation whose literature has declared labor a curse, has done most to prove it a blessing. The Greeks despised labor. The Roman freeman, who had not a coat to his back, was above labor. "Only a slave," said he, "should toil." What a weight of meaning for all ages in the contrast.

Commerce was regarded a doubtful good. Productive labor alone has the full sanction of the law, the prophets, and the sages. But the Jews did not heed their John Ruskin. And they have become the middle men of the world.

11. Meanwhile, the settled, peaceful life has its peculiar dangers. The rich grow richer; and the poor, poorer. The ancestral estates become alienated. That form of society in which it was planned that every family should own a strip of soil gives way to one in which

there are beggars and tramps. Hebrews of pure blood sell their wives, their children, and themselves into slavery. The rich grow harsh, cruel, and arrogant. The poor are not only debarred from the rights of citizens, but the privileges of religion are also denied them. All this calls for a moral reformation. The prophets cry out against oppression. The rich cannot have allowed these pleas to pass unheeded. Nehemiah refused to draw his salary, because the people are poor; and he feeds the laborers at his own expense. There is a growing conviction that neither riches nor poverty is the ideal; both have their peculiar temptations. The religion comes to place charity and righteousness in the same category.

12. A growing emphasis is placed upon education. None of the early Bible stories turn upon the ability to read and write, and it is probable that writing was not very common in the days of the first writing prophets. Education consisted in committing to memory the traditions. In the laws of Deuteronomy we note a remarkable change. The people are now supposed to be able to read. Portions of the book are posted in public places. The parents are exhorted to teach their children the law of the Lord. The king is to have a copy of the civil law near at hand, and he is to read it. From the days of Josiah, the Jews began to pay more attention to education for its own sake. The wisdom literature was becoming common. This was practical rather than theoretical or religious, and presupposed a love of knowledge for itself alone. All this comes to a climax in certain portions of Job and Proverbs, and in the Apocryphal Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sirach.

New elements of a truly noble nature are gradually imported into the ritual which at first was so full of superstitions. The social value of the coming together into the presence of the Lord is magnified. Many psalms glorify the blessings of the communion of men with each other and with God. Together they exalt their daily life, and inspire each other with noble thoughts. They sing together of the sweetness of the home life, and of the nobility of a pure conscience. The mellowing influences of common thoughts on a common destiny are charmingly portrayed.

13. But what renders all these subjects so full of interest, what gives unique value to all the lessons the Bible brings us, is the divineness of its religion. No doubt this had very humble beginnings. But, however that may be, any true estimate of it must take it at its best. Where many modern sociologists are weak, the Bible writers are strongest. They see the divine plan in history. Their sociology is not static, but dynamic. They do not look into the past only, but into the future as well. "See, in order to foresee," is their motto. And they never tire of affirming that if we would see God in the future, we must look for him in the present; if he has spoken to us in the past, he has a yet better message in the present. Isaiah complains to his people of their undue conservatism. They are contiuually appealing to what Jehovah said to their fathers, and ignoring what he is now saying to them. All the prophets believed in a living God. He was as near to them as he had been to their fathers. They made their religion a living force, not a dead creed, not a system of theology. It is the belief in a living inspiration, in the real

inner strength and goodness of society, as such, that renders the message of the Biblical authors so full of help and consolation. It is the triumph of the divine in them that has made them our teachers in religion and in sociology for all time.

To the believer in the Biblical religion who unites with his faith a strong conviction of the general truthfulness of modern progress, Biblical sociology will present many strong claims to the title of science.

CHAPTER X.

SOME ANCIENT AND MODERN ESTIMATES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"This age may be best characterized as the age of criticism, a criticism to which everything must submit. Religion, on the ground of its sanctity, and law, on the ground of its majesty, often resist this sifting of their claims. But, in so doing, they inevitably awake a not unjust suspicion that their claims are ill-founded, and they can no longer expect the unfeigned homage paid by reason to that which has shown itself able to stand the test of free inquiry."

IMMANUEL KANT.

CHAPTER X.

SOME ANCIENT AND MODERN ESTIMATES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. WHAT, in the days since the dawn of Christianity, have men, whose opinions are worth heeding, believed the Old Testament to be? This is a question which possesses a living interest, and any impartial investigation in this field is sure to yield rich results.

We find, in the first place, that the Orthodox Jews accept their Scriptures as a complete and sufficient revelation of the will of the Lord their God, containing a fully developed moral code, and a ritual, to comply with which is to save the soul. They are blind followers of the letter of the law. Nothing can be learned, in fact, outside the Hebrew Bible and the Talmud. The work of the Orthodox Jews upon their Scriptures has been almost wholly conservative. They have done nothing to aid the modern reconstruction of their history. Avoiding altogether modern scholarship, they rather prefer to revel in the speculations of the Talmud. They still believe, with the Jewish authors of the early Christian centuries, that the law existed in the depths of the divine nature before time was, that it is in very truth the eternal image of the spiritual being of God, that it is identical with heavenly wisdom, and that God's love goes out to it willingly and

spontaneously in tenderest affection. The law is, to the pious Jew, the daughter of God, in whom God loved himself as in his own image. By one writer the law is made to say, "God begat me from eternity as the first-ling of his way, as the first beginning of his work." And, according to another writer, it was said that God himself spends the first three hours of the day in the study of the law.

The law is, to the Orthodox Jew, God's only revelation of salvation. Piety is love for the law; the essence of religion is to live according to the law, and it will be the essence of religion for all time. The Jews are the people of the law, and the study and practice of the law insure the presence of God in their midst. The prophets were but inspired commentators of the law, and the oral tradition was its authentic and God-given interpretation.[1]

The Reform Jews, on the other hand, are thoroughly in touch with modern aims and ideals. They are protestants in that they reject or thoroughly sift the Rabbinical traditions, and return to an independent study of the Bible itself. They hold to no hard and fast creed, but gladly accept the results of modern science, philosophy, and historical criticism. Their reverence for the Old Testament is akin to that of the liberal Christian for the New. And some of the best work on the Jewish Scriptures in our day is being done by Reformed Jews.

2. The New Testament idea of the Old Testament is the Orthodox Jewish idea, with such modifications as the new elements in Christianity would naturally neces-

[1] Weber's Altsynagogale Theologie, SS. 16, 34, etc.

sitate. It must not be forgotten that the Old Testament was the only Bible that Jesus and the apostles possessed. And it proved to them a constant source of inspiration and hope. It furnished the basis for a pure moral and religious life, and, above all, it became a powerful weapon in the hands of the early Christians in their controversies with the Gentiles. It is to be expected, then, that the New Testament writers will hold the Old Testament in the highest esteem.

Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, says he came not to abrogate the law of the prophets but to fulfil them; that is, he came not to set aside the law as having no authority (καταλύειν), but to live up to it, obey it, and so fulfil it (πληροῦν). In the same context he continues, one "i" or one piece of a letter shall not pass from even a word of the Old Testament, until all its mission for righteousness and the kingdom of God is accomplished (πάντα γένηται).[1] The thought seems to be, if the words are really those of Jesus, that the Old Testament retains its authority until the truth finds a higher authority in the new heart, and in the momentum of a righteous life (vs. 20). The Old Testament, then, has its supreme value, not in the fact that it foretells the Messiah and prepares the world for him, but in that it teaches by precept and example a form of righteousness which will endure till heaven and earth pass away. The fulfilment of a law is its abrogation only to him who, by obedience, is ready to put aside the milk of the word and partake of the solid meat.

[1] Matt. v. 17–20 is a confused and confusing section. Weizsäcker, Hilgenfeld, and others, may be right in saying that vss. 18, 19, are not words of Jesus.

Prof. Edward Caird says, that, when Jesus spoke of the kingdom of God as resembling a kernel of wheat, which, put into the earth, multiplies by dying, he "gave a clearer expression to the idea of development than it had ever before received."[1] Equally significant with the passage referred to by Caird and in the same direction are the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. xix. 11, "All men cannot receive this saying." This certainly implies that Christianity is not primarily a doctrine, merely as such, but a higher type of religious life, founded upon the Old Testament, and supplementing its ideal, but never setting it wholly aside.

The continued usefulness of precepts of varying degrees of ethical and religious completeness is well illustrated also by a passage in the Teaching of the Apostles, vi. 2. "If indeed thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou wilt be perfect: but if thou art not able, do what thou canst" (ὅ δύνῃ τοῦτο ποιεῖ).

This I believe was the view of Jesus. The Old Testament possesses permanent value, because there are always those in society who are sufficiently hard of heart and dull of hearing to be helped by it; while, on the other hand, Jesus certainly taught that the higher commands possessed authority for those who were able to receive them.

Paul seems to have at one time believed in the Old Testament in a more technical way than Jesus ever did. When he accepted Christianity, however, he sought to set aside this technique, though without being wholly able to do so. He speaks at one time in favor of the law, and at another time against it. And it is by no

[1] Evolution of Religion, vol. i. p. 25.

means clear in every instance just what his meaning may be. If we could affirm that, when he spoke against the law, he had in mind its ritual and merely formal morality, and that, when he spoke in its praise, he was thinking of its ethical and ideal character, the difficulty would be solved. But Paul nowhere tells us that he so speaks, and, further, Meyer is doubtless right when he says that "the distinction between the ritualistic, civil, and moral law is modern."

The New Testament, as a whole, does not regard the Jewish revelation as confined to our present Old Testament. On several occasions the Apocryphal Old Testament is quoted as having authority, and various references in the New Testament seem to be to books now lost. In a creative period a hard and fast theory of inspiration is out of the question, and the New Testament writers show great freedom, both in the character of the authorities employed, and in the manner of using them.[1]

3. The early Christian Church accepted almost without change the Orthodox Jewish view of the Old Testament. While they rejected the Talmud and the Tradition, they followed the Jews in the great body of their interpretations. One important difference, of course, was that of the belief about the Messiah. The Jews and Christians were practically in agreement as to the number and meaning of the Messianic passages. But the Jews denied that these were fulfilled in Jesus

[1] Cf. Heb. i. 3 and Wisdom vii. 26. Jas. i. 9, 19 and Ecclus. iv. 29, v. 11. Heb. xi. 35, 36 and 2 Macc. vi. 18–vii. 42. Heb. xi. 37 and Ascension of Isaiah. Jude 9 and the Assumption of Moses. Jude 14–16 and the Book of Enoch. See also the non-Biblical names in 2 Tim. iii. 8.

of Nazareth. In the third century of our era the Christians looked upon the Old and New Testaments as *sui generis*. The scriptures of other peoples were, by the majority, believed to be purposely base, vile, plagiaristic, and harmful. But the *Biblia*, or books of the Old and New Testaments, were believed to be the complete word of God to men.

While this was true of the Orthodox Christians, the heretical sects looked upon the Old Testament with distrust. The Gnostics were, as a rule, opposed to the Old Testament. Basilides, to be sure, looked upon the God of the Old Testament as indeed the Creator of the world. But he was not therefore God, but an angel (ἄρχων) who presided over the lowest of the three hundred and sixty-five kingdoms of the ineffable God.

Marcion (*floruit* 139 A.D.) likewise held that Jehovah was the Creator, but not the God of the universe. He saw only the lower and material elements in the Old Testament. Even the Messiah of the Old Testament is far from the real Christ, according to Marcion. He is sensuously and physically conceived, as was Jehovah. Naturally, then, the ethical and religious portions of the Old Testament are looked upon as external, and grounded in law, and not in love.[1] The sect of the Ophites went still farther, and pronounced the Old Testament immoral, and completely at variance with the religion of the Spirit.

4. Modern writers upon the religions classify them in various ways, and by this estimate them. One of the most common divisions is that into natural and revealed. The natural religions are the heathen reli-

[1] Hase's Christian Church, pp.

gions, or more properly, they are the nature religions that are without great prophets, as, for example, Brahmanism, and the religions of Greece and Rome. The revealed religions are the religions that have their origin in some great man, as, for example, Mosaism, or Judaism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and Christianity. By another classification the religions are subjective, objective, or absolute, according as God is conceived as transcending the world, or as immanent in it, or as both immanent and transcendent. The pantheistic religions magnify the immanence of the divine, as do the Classical and Indian religions. Judaism, on the other hand, magnifies the transcendence of God. Christianity harmonizes the two conceptions. Schopenhauer classifies the religions as optimistic or pessimistic, according as they look upon life as a good or an evil. Buddhism and Christianity are to him pessimistic. Judaism is optimistic. God saw all that he had made, and, behold, it was exceeding good.

5. According to Kant, the essence of religion consists in a belief in God, Freedom, and Immortality. Judaism is not clear, theoretically, on the doctrine of freedom, and, practically, freedom is denied, and life is reduced to a slavish obedience to a written code, literally construed. As to the third essential, the Old Testament has no positive word, and therefore, for Kant, Judaism had no religious faith, because it had no belief in a future life. And a polytheism superior to Judaism is clearly conceivable. The ethical portion of the Old Testament is equally obnoxious to Kant. He seems to have looked entirely to the priestly books for his [illegible]timate, and he naturally finds it making use of igno-

ble motives, and summed up in useless forms. He does not hesitate to say that it was the aim of Judaism, not to establish a theocracy, but to secularize religion, and reduce all to a merely civil society.

Hegel's estimate of the Old Testament has the defects and the merits of a cast-iron method. At the foot of the ladder we have animism, fetichism, and the nature religious, pure and simple. At the top we have Christianity, the absolute religion. As rungs in the ladder we have the religions of Greece, Rome, and Jerusalem. Greece looked after the intellect and gave us philosophy, beauty, freedom, and humanity. Rome looked after the will and gave us purpose, practice, and character. The contribution of the Jew was the least important of all. He gave us an absentee God, and the feeling of sublimity and of dualism. Yet Hegel admits that any compromise on the part of the Hebrews with the nature religions would have been fatal to the contribution which they have made to the spiritual consciousness of mankind. They insisted upon the oneness and absoluteness of God. "The content of the Hebrew conception of God is pure, non-sensuous thought; the relation of the individual to this being is a relation to pure thought. . . . The religious service which the Jew was called upon to render was accordingly a severe and hard one; it was a service of ceremony and of law. The Jews confessed themselves as owing whatever they were to the one God, Jehovah; thus the individual, whether person or race, lacked the consciousness of independence, freedom, worth. Hence, adds Hegel, we find among the Jews no belief in the immortality of the soul. The family here possesses the independence

that the individual lacks; it is to the family that, so to speak, spiritual substantiality belongs. The worship of Jehovah is a worship rendered by the family. The state, on the other hand, is foreign to the principle of Jewish life and to the legislation of Moses."[1]

Schelling held that the religion of the Old Testament was a revealed and spiritual religion, and that Jehovah was the true God, but as it arose in an age of darkness, it was impossible that it should be other than imperfect. It was deeply influenced by the enemies it slew. It reacted in an extreme way against some, and was unduly drawn towards others.

The late Prof. Hermann Lotze held the Hebrew religion in high esteem.[2] He especially commended that people for leaving us the only complete history of their early mental life. And while he finds in the Hebrew language defects which were due to limitations in their intellectual interest in various phenomena, he finds there also elements which bespeak the deepest ethical and religious feeling and aspiration. He says, "The descriptive poetry of the Hebrews depicts characters and events with the greatest simplicity of expression, without the least artificial complication of motives, disclosing everywhere, without reserve, those natural springs of action which, as long as the world lasts, will be the real ultimate incentives of all that men do."

Lotze wrote sufficiently late to be influenced in his estimate of the Hebrew religion by the critical views of his time. Yet it is a wholesome sign, and one amounting to independent confirmation, when one of

[1] Morris's Hegel's Philosophy of History, p. 168.

[2] Microcosmus, vol. i. p. 6; vol. ii. pp. 401 fol., 466 fol.

Lotze's importance affirms that the Hebrew ethics produced the Hebrew religion. "The motive power of their development is to be found in ethical ideas, which, though not indeed alien to the life of other nations, were not the source from which their religious motives were derived."

Lotze was of the opinion that the Hebrews so conceived of their God as to avoid the philosophical dualism of which they are often accused. God was wholly good, and nothing evil left his hand. But man was created free, and by disobedience he introduced evil into the world, while by obedience he might have become holy as God is holy.

6. Newman Smyth, in his "Christian Ethics," lays especial emphasis upon the social side of the Old Testament religion. The Hebrew ideal of the highest good is said to be a social conception. "Abraham's faith was a social trust." The Hebrew morality was organic; it looked forward to a society whose members should be, in very truth, living members one of another. "Family permanence and social stability" were the ideals desired above all.[1] "No single solitary soul can win life's largest blessing apart from his brethren."

As emphasizing and at the same time glorifying the social side of the Old Testament, may be mentioned also Ely's "Social Aspects of Christianity."[2]

Just as fast as crude and indefensible claims for the truthfulness of the science of the Bible cease, so rapidly do the scientists come to the support of the writer on Christian evidences. Let a scientist approach Genesis as he approaches Heraclitus or Pythagoras, take it

[1] Page 91 of Christian Ethics. [2] Page 151 fol.

for just what it is, and estimate it in the light of its age, and he cannot but be amazed at the large measure of its truthfulness. Haeckel pays to the Hebrew creation story a lofty tribute. Von Baer says, "no more lofty account has come down to us from early days." Lotze says of it, that it is "sublimer than any other, because it represents as forthwith existing what the Deity willed to be, without weakening the impression of omnipotence by any mention of intervening physical agencies." Inasmuch as the Hebrews were not scientists in any sense of the word, Dillmann can account for the origin of the first chapter of Genesis only on the basis of an inspiration from God.[1]

7. "It is not the object of any Bible student, properly so-called," says Myron Adams, "to destroy the Bible or to undermine its proper and reasonable influence. His object is to discover just what the Bible is, and how it came to be what it is." We must be aided in our answers to these questions by a broad and careful study of human progress in all its branches. "All progress is co-ordinate." The church of the tenth century could easily accept the doctrine of transubstantiation, because the science of that day taught that one metal could be transmuted into another. Bad science helped to make a bad theology and *vice versâ*.

Along with the idea of the extreme almightiness of God, grew up the idea that God could make the world out of nothing. If God could make something out of nothing, he could do other things equally marvellous. He could make the Bible out of nothing. He could pop the whole Pentateuch suddenly into the mind of

[1] Die Genesis *in loco*.

Moses, ready made. Moses could give laws for which Israel would have no use for centuries. To be sure, this isn't the way society moves nowadays. Now it is hard to get the laws when we are ready for them. Why? Because we have to make our laws out of our needs. We have discarded the idea that the world was made out of nothing. It violates a fundamental law of thought. When we have been forced from the position that the world was made out of nothing, we naturally feel impelled to abandon the idea that the Bible was made out of nothing. We begin to seek for causes, conditions, and opportunities. We study the Biblical authors on the human side, we seek to know the secret of their inspirations.

Some of us were brought up to think that the Bible must not be studied as are other phenomena and other books. But when we search for the cause of all this, we find it goes back for its origin to an age of introspection, as opposed to a later age of the careful study of nature. We have learned to study nature, to study it as a work of God. And we study nature with perfect freedom, criticising and correcting. We have come to look upon the work of man as that of perfecting what the divine spirit is aiming at in the universe. Now, to hold this idea of God's world, and at the same time to deny the right of man to deal thus with God's book, is to reveal a very confused state of mind. *It is to show to the world that while we have learned our lesson, we have not yet learned the meaning of it.* "If God had authentically written every word of the Bible, if he had caused all the printing and arrangement of it, and the very binding itself to be done in heaven, it would

be still open to men for their inspection and criticism." But the Bible was not so produced. It came to us through human media, — much more then is it our duty to inspect and criticise it, and adapt it to our own moral and religious needs.

8. Another fact worthy of consideration is this, that the Biblical writers were specialists. Their abilities and inspirations in one direction do not assure us that they are equally gifted in other directions. Indeed, all analogy is against this. A man's excellence in one department of learning is often coupled with defects in other departments. There is nothing in inspiration that can guard a Biblical author from these human limitations. Along with this comes also the fact that the whole race was once far behind where it now is in knowledge. The Bible has all the marks of its age and its nation stamped upon it. "It came into being as a human production as really as anything else which has ever become extant among us." This search for natural causes has been marvellously fruitful in revealing the hidden meaning of many Biblical passages. And the frank admission that the Biblical writers were religious specialists, making no claim to more than common abilities and common honesty in other domains of culture, and, above all, basing their highest claim to be heard on the value of their message to their own age; the frank admission of these facts, I say, must bring at last all the great minds into sympathetic relations with the Old Testament and its noble religion.

CHAPTER XI.

EVOLUTION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"Until the problem has been stated in its most dangerous form, all solutions of it must be partial and inadequate. They must leave, after all, an inexplicable surd."

EDWARD CAIRD.

"Evolution is continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces."

LE CONTE.

"There is a great distinction to be drawn between the fact of evolution and the manner of it, or between the evidence of evolution, as having taken place somehow, and the evidence of the causes which have been concerned in the process."

ROMANES.

CHAPTER XI.

EVOLUTION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. OBVIOUSLY the search for that in man which is the source of progress is beset with an ever-increasing number of facts, going to show that, at the outset, man had no moral, intellectual, religious, or social life at all, in the proper sense of these words. At the outset there was no society. Man could not be studied in his relations; for at that early day, when he had just issued from pure animalism, he had no idea of law, no definite relations. Professor Caird sees this difficulty, and says: "The phenomena of savage life are equally irrelevant to the religious and to the moral history of mankind. If morality takes its rise in the conflict between the ideal of duty and the life of animal instinct, then we can scarcely say that man, when he is almost wholly imprisoned in the circle of natural events and impulses, has yet entered on his career as a moral being. And, for the same reason, the Fetichist can scarcely be said to have entered into the sphere of religion."[1] Religion and morals are there, but they are "latent." They are present in much the same way as science and art are present in the new-born babe. And the question arises, are they in the child at the beginning, are they in his environment, or are they the outcome of the reaction

[1] J. Caird's Philosophy of Religion, p. 329.

of the one upon the other? A savage counting his fingers is a prophecy of the higher calculus and of quaternions. A savage bowing to sticks and stones is a prophecy of the Christian consciousness. But who fulfils this prophecy? These "latent" powers are valuable just to the extent that they are *evolved*. But is this evolution anything more than a manifestation of what already is? I have kept in this discussion Professor Caird's word "*latent*." Modern physicists have, however, set the word aside as misleading. They say it is but another word for potential.

As the word *latent* has been set aside in physics as misleading, so it should be in speaking of the powers of man. Says Prof. T. H. Green, "In the growth of our experience, in the process of our learning to know the world, an animal organism, which has its history in time, gradually becomes the vehicle of an eternally complete consciousness. What we call our mental history is not a history of this consciousness, which, in itself, can have no history, but a history of the process by which the animal organism becomes its vehicle." [1]

2. It is a failure to grasp this conception that must account for a vast amount of confusion in the popular religious mind on the questions of the evolution of man and of his institutions. It is forgotten that the word "origin" has a twofold meaning. It may refer to the origin of a phenomenon in time, or to the original and eternal idea which is more or less imperfectly embodied in the phenomenon. To illustrate, the beginning of a house is not to be sought in the first blow of the pick or hammer, but in the ideally formed plan and

[1] Prolegomena to Ethics, p. 72.

purpose to build a house. The true origin of an elm-tree is not in the first swelling and sprouting of the life in the seed. There is the most essential element back of this, in the peculiar organization of the protoplasm which determines it as an elm, and not an ash or oak. In other words, then, the essential origin of a thing is not to be found in its earliest and most incomplete, but in its latest and most complete manifestation. The origin of science, ethics, religion, and civilization is to be found not in the remote past, but in the present. The best sample of the eternal consciousness is not the least evolved, but the most evolved consciousness. Man is not only the end, but the beginning of nature. Nature becomes conscious of herself in man, and man in his turn may read her secrets. And in spelling out these secrets, he is but traversing with nature the path that led to himself. The study of the evolution of religion must, then, begin and end with the ideally perfect man. If we leave this ideal out at the beginning of our study, and start with that which is only animal and brutish, we must posit the existence somewhere of a "latent," or hidden, or as yet unevolved, force which is to gradually appear to us.[1] In other words, we would be letting in by stealth, little by little, and at a side door, what we refused admittance over the threshold. With all our pains, therefore, we may not find the true origin of our religion, and be able to state it with completeness. For even if we seek it in the present, it remains that we do not fully understand our own tendencies, our own moods, and all the grounds of our conscious life. We

[1] E. Caird's Social Phil. and Rel. of Comte.

feel that there is a force working in us whose ends are only partly known to us. It is therefore often said of our greatest prophets and teachers, past and present, that they builded better than they knew. But if this is so, then these men do not fully understand themselves. And as Professor Erdmann has profoundly remarked, a philosophy that does not understand itself cannot be a complete philosophy. So, also, a man who does not understand himself cannot be a complete man. The grandeur of the future is not yet half revealed to us. And until that day comes we must not be too sure about origins, for the true origins of man and society are to be sought at the end of history, not at the beginning, nor at the ages midway between.[1]

3. While thus, according to such writers as the Cairds and Green, the essential causes of progress are hid in the immutable counsels of God, they are not at all adverse to the work of those writers who search deeply into the history of our civilization for the occasioning causes of our advancement. They are, indeed, especially friendly to this kind of investigation when it is pursued in the proper spirit. So, then, while we may admit that progress is no more than the manifestation of a consciousness which is eternally the same, and is itself the efficient cause of that progress, we are in duty bound to discover, so far as we may, what are the conditions most favorable to the growth of that consciousness. And we may also hope for some light in the solution of the question by studying religion from the point of view of the evolution of religion. By no means is it necessary that such a study

[1] See J. Caird's Philosophy of Religion, p. 346.

be negative or rationalistic. In theistic evolution the resident force in the world is none other than the immanent God. Evolution stands for a great and mighty truth, so also does theism, and they are not antagonistic to each other.

The study of religion from the point of view of the evolutionist is of comparatively recent date. Yet this method of investigation and apologetics strikes its roots deep into the past.

4. In 1780 Gotthold Ephraim Lessing published a wonderful work, though scarce more than a pamphlet in size, entitled "The Education of the Human Race." Its opening sentence strikes a new note in the history of religion, and sheds a new and before unknown harmony over the sacred Scriptures. "That which education is to the individual," affirms Lessing, "revelation is to the race. Education is revelation coming to the individual man; and revelation is education which has come, and is yet coming, to the human race." This is the author's point of view throughout. Revelation gives us nothing which is beyond reason, nothing which is beyond the ordinary faculties of mind and soul to attain; but, thanks to the assistance of men whose faculties have been quickened by the divine Spirit, these truths come to us earlier through revelation than they otherwise could have done. If revelation is education, then all lessons obviously may not be taught to the race at once. There must be a rational plan and order in the procedure. Not all the attributes of God will be apprehended at once and with equal clearness on the part of the people. The divine plan, then, adapts the lessons to the pupils. So also the higher ethical mo-

tives are for a long season kept in the background. The Bible is, as its name implies, a library, and the oldest books are primers. They are such as would be adapted to children to-day; they were even better adapted to the child-race. Education is carried on "by rewards and punishments addressed to the senses." Had God revealed himself to man at the outset in all his fulness, there would have been the "same fault in the divine rule as is committed by the schoolmaster, who chooses to hurry his pupil too rapidly." Because, however, the Bible shows God to have been a wise schoolmaster, it also shows that his chosen people, while they have been overtaken and surpassed here and there by "more happily organized" children of nature, are yet, in the grand total, far in advance of all others in the knowledge and practice of truth.

To Lessing, as to Kant, the absence of a doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament occasions serious difficulties. While the earlier portions of the Bible are a primer and are adapted to a child-race, they "must contain absolutely nothing which blocks up the way towards the knowledge which is held back." While the primer must be suited to its readers, it must contain nothing which is absolute error. Lessing thinks that for the early race there was a real gain in omitting all positive teaching regarding individual immortality.[1] For, while this was held in abeyance, the ethical life was being firmly planted upon a surer basis than would have been

[1] To be sure the oldest parts of the Old Testament reveal a belief in the immortality of the national life. And the Jews had the examples of Enoch and Elijah who had not died. Yet, for all this, the question in Job xiv. 14 was not answered.

possible had the popular thought been dominated by a belief in a future world of rewards and punishments.

At last the child-race becomes a youth. "Sweetmeats and toys give place to the budding desire to be free." Slowly there comes the consciousness of intellectual and moral freedom. This is, to Lessing, the period when the Hebrews came to pure monotheism, to a belief in Jehovah as the absolute God of the universe. "Revelation had guided their reason, and now, all at once, reason gave clearness to their revelation. . . . And the cultivation of revealed truths into truths of reason is absolutely necessary, if the human race is to be assisted by them."

The education of the human race reaches its highest mark in the life and teachings of Christ. Yet Lessing refuses to consider "contemptible" the views of those who predict that "the New Covenant must become as antiquated as the Old." He merely refuses to limit the teaching and revealing powers of the infinite God. And he warns, on the other hand, against rashness in affirming the old primers effete. There are many backward pupils, and some are very backward. For the sake of these let no evil word be said against the primer. What is taken "for a blunder in the teaching," by the rashly wise, may be the highest mark of teaching skill, when all the details are known. Nor is it safe to deny to a precept its title to divineness because it is found among all early civilizations. "God makes immediate revelations of mere truths of reason, or has permitted and caused pure truths of reason to be taught for some time as truths of immediate revelation, in order to promulgate them the more rapidly, and ground them the more firmly."

Here we have the first beginnings of the application of the principle of development to the sacred Scriptures. And they who to-day are seeking to discover all the laws and manners of the evolution of pure religion among men are following in the lines pointed out by Lessing.

5. Since Lessing's time a wonderful advance has been made, and now no scholar thinks of studying the great religions except in the light of their origins and subsequent developments.

No careful student of the origin and development of religions can any longer deny the main postulates of the philosophy of evolution. This is evident from the fact that no religion enters, or has entered, the world perfect, either morally or ideally.[1] This being admitted, it is certainly worth our while to inquire what are the laws of growth, and, that we may use them for analogy and suggestion, what are the laws of evolution in plant and animal life? It is not any longer a mark of wisdom to deny to the student of Christianity the right and duty to investigate the claims of his religion in the light of these lately-discovered laws. We may even go farther, and maintain that the facts of religion ought to be classified in accordance with these laws, just as other phenomena are classified. We may, I think, accept the argument as given by Professor Le Conte in his "Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought," and attempt, on the basis of this, to add new light to

[1] Possibly Christianity is an exception, yet the facts, seemingly, are the other way. Jesus "grew in knowledge;" Paul's theology developed. And the Church was not perfect till it had gathered of every sort, and so proved the absoluteness of its message.

the theological doctrines of revelation, redemption, and regeneration. It will soon appear that all in the old doctrines that really corresponded in a healthful way with human experience is still there, and that many new correspondences have been discovered. It appears that Christianity has found a real and life-giving environment in humanity.

6. But, apparently, we are not yet ready to apply in detail the methods of evolution to religion. We are quibbling over evolution as a philosophy; we are misrepresenting and misunderstanding each other, when we ought to be using evolution as a method, as a working hypothesis, for the uplifting of the race. We all want evolution in religion. We want a more universal theology, may I say a more humane theology? We want a purer standard of ethics, and a larger number of our fellows living moral and spiritual lives. Now, what are the laws of this evolution? What are they in the natural world? What are they in the social world of man? These questions answered, and we are in a position to reinvigorate our religion on both the practical and the theoretical side. We are able to enter intelligently into the work of human redemption, and cooperate with God, where often heretofore he has been compelled to work alone, because, with our little philosophy, and our little theology, we quite often "get in the way" in our efforts to help.

Another idea which has vitiated the studies of many scholars is this, that the religious instinct is the source of all progress. This is not strictly true; the evolution of religion has, as a matter of fact, gone hand in hand with man's social and moral advance. The religion of

Israel, at the outset, was not moral at all, in our sense of the word. But the earliest religions and the earliest morality go hand in hand. "Instead of leading the way in social and ethical progress, religion was often content to follow, or even to lag behind."[1] Again, of a primitive community Professor Smith says, "Its friends are the god's friends, its enemies the god's enemies! It takes its god with it in whatsoever it chooses to do." So far the historian and the exegete! but the philosopher does not object. Dr. Pfleiderer says, whether the course of a particular religion "is to lead upward or downward depends from the first on the attitude taken up toward the moral potencies of life." In another place he makes religious development reciprocally dependent upon "*the development of civilization.*" The italics are Pfleiderer's. If we grant that Christianity has been a moral force, we have yet to search for the source of Christianity's power to adapt itself to our advancing life. Advance steps have almost invariably been taken (have they not?) by scientists, philosophers, and philanthropists, who, technically speaking, were not Christians. I doubt if ethics is so entirely dependent upon religion as some scholars have maintained. Both have original roots in human nature, and each will reciprocally aid the other, and neither will appear at its best without the normal activity of the other.

7. In recent years two Christian scholars have, in a thorough-going way, applied the method of evolution to religious science. One of these is an Old Testament specialist, and the other is a professor of philoso-

[1] W. R. Smith's Religion of the Semites, p. 53.

phy. Both these men are justly eminent. Robertson Smith sees and proclaims that the facts at hand in Old Testament science furnish a "variety of evidence to show that the type of religion which is founded on kinship, and in which the deity and his worshippers make up a society united by the bond of blood, was widely prevalent; and that at an early date, among all the Semitic peoples. But the force of the evidence goes further, and leaves no reasonable doubt that among the Semites this was the original type of religion, out of which all other types grew."[1]

Prof. Edward Caird says, "This whole historic process [the development of Hebrew religion] furnishes perhaps the most striking of all illustrations of religious evolution. In other words, it exhibits to us a typical instance of the development of a religious idea from lower to higher forms, till, finally, it exhausts itself and dies, only, however, to rise again in a religion of a much higher type."[2]

Professor Smith's statement is by no means a sporadic one; there are four hundred pages of proof. From scores of sources, the Bible among them, evidence is brought forth showing that the early Semites believed that they were related to their gods by blood, and were their lineal descendants. The tribes were held together by a common religion; viz., the worship of a reputed ancestor, or totem animal. The Calebites were a tribe who attributed their origin to a dog. A similar belief, no doubt, gave rise to the expression "Lion tribe of Judah." Passages in the Old Testament which suggest

[1] Religion of the Semites, p. 51.

[2] Evolution of Religion, vol. i. p. 398.

these ideas to the critical student are found in 1 Sam. xx. 29, and Judges xviii. 19.[1] So, then, we are not able to follow a recent author when he says, "As a matter of fact, in the most ancient and most influential religions of the world, we do not find any outline of any such evolution as Mr. Spencer suggests." I do not pretend to say that Cheyne, Stade, and W. R. Smith accept Spencer's theory of religion as a complete explanation of all the phenomena; but these scholars are in too close agreement with Spencer, and with the more recent evolutionists in particular, to warrant the assertion that Spencer and Darwin are on the wrong side of this question altogether.

In fact, special students are also working among the documents bearing upon the origins of other religions, and various fields of research are yielding material that confirms the main outlines of the evolution theory of the origin of religion. The opinion of Mueller, to which many assent, that the more we go back toward the sources of the various religions the purer we find their conceptions of the Deity, does not commend itself to the scientific scholarship of our day. It may, perhaps, be said that the oldest literary statement of religious belief that we have is a pure monotheism. But Professor Sayce has argued, and not in vain, to show that this literary statement marks not the beginning, but the close of a long historic development.[2]

8. Prof. E. Caird's volumes on the "Evolution of Re-

[1] Cf. also Stade's Geschichte des Volkes Israel, iii. 403, and Cheyne's Isa. ii. 121, 122, 291.

[2] For further discussion of Smith's Religion of the Semites, see the chapter on the Way of Salvation.

ligion" are exceedingly fresh and stimulating. There is all the inspiration and insight of a prophet, and all the candor and frankness of a scholar in these pages. Professor Caird believes in the reign of law, but by this he certainly does not mean the exclusive reign of those laws which we have come to speak of as physical. "To say that there is a universal reign of law, and that nothing happens without a cause, is by no means to say that there is one kind of law and one kind of cause for everything." And especially is it true, in human affairs, that the motives to action have changed as the mind and heart have developed in sensitiveness and in strength.[1] Between us and the past, in this respect, is a great chasm; and, as Professor Caird thinks, only by the aid of evolution can we bridge over the chasm between us and that past.[2] Certainly we cannot defend that past, as a whole, except for its own niche in history. But when we have so defended it, we have put ourselves into the best possible position to recognize what its real merits, its permanent elements are.

A difficulty in the way of a comprehensive study of religion appears at the outset in the definition that is given to religion. By some definitions all but Christianity are false religions, or not religions at all. If we include the intellectual and moral elements to any great degree, many of the lower types are excluded. Then we are forced to say that religion arose *de novo* by spe-

[1] Not until the time of Daniel's book, 160, did the Jews believe that the head was the seat of thought. In all the earlier books the "heart" is the organ of reflection.

[2] Evolution of Religion, vol. i. p. 25.

cial revelation, that it began with the great man. There is certainly something to be said for this view. But, as a matter of fact, some of the historic religions were nature religions, and, so far as we know, do not owe their origin to a great religious teacher. Further, even in the case of the revealed religions, it is obvious that their prophets must be, to a very large extent, explained by their environments. Their messages are influenced by that against which they react, and by the needs of the people to whom they appeal. For this reason Caird objects to any arbitrary definition of religion. Any definition which cuts across the line of human development, shutting out all which do not come up to a certain standard, is to make a helpful study of the evolution of religion impossible.[1] So, too, to take the common element in all religions as a basis is pernicious; "what we want is, rather, the germinative principle." That principle is a thirst for a more complete, harmonious, and perfect life. Says Professor Caird, "A man's religion is the expression of his ultimate attitude to the universe, the summed-up meaning and purport of his whole consciousness of things. How, and how far, he arises above the parts to the whole; how, and how far, he gathers his scattered consciousness of the world and of himself to a unity; how, and how far, he makes anything like a final return upon himself from all his fortunes and experiences, is shown more clearly in his religion than in any other expression of his inner life."[2] This definition tells the whole story. Man's religion advances *pari passu* with himself. And the germinating principle is the desire for a perfect life;

[1] Op. Cit., p. 46. [2] Op. Cit., p. 30.

it is the resident force, it is the indwelling God coming to ever more complete expression. And "if religion ever becomes extinct, it can only be because it has served its purpose, and has given rise to some more comprehensive form of life."

Prof. A. B. Bruce accepts in a general way the conclusions reached by such scholars as Caird and Smith, and bases his defence of the earlier and lower forms of Old Testament religion and morality entirely upon the fact that God could not fully reveal himself to primitive man and primitive society. The application of the evolution philosophy to religion and especially to the Biblical religion has, in fact, completely revolutionized apologetics; and the new apologetics must succeed ultimately in restoring the Old Testament to favor among many intelligent and earnest religious people who, by the old views, were forced to regard many of its chapters as only immoral and degrading.

CHAPTER XII.

LEISURELY RAMBLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SOME OF ITS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS.

QUESTION. "*What is to save me from falling into the power of some foolish, or ignorant, or partisan writer, and being put off with views which lack the approval of the wise?*

ANSWER. "*One safeguard lies in discovering who are the leading writers on your topic. As you run your eye along the margin of one book after another on the subject, you will be pretty sure to see certain names repeated again and again. Writers of various grades and opinions will agree in their recurring references to these names. The references possibly may nearly all be for the purpose of stricture and refutation. Never mind. A book which many writers think worth controverting is pretty sure to be worth reading. . . . Drop other books and go for these. . . . These are the writers to cultivate, if you would save time in the end, and have opinions which shall be something more than the echo of echoes.*"

J. H. THAYER.

CHAPTER XII.

LEISURELY RAMBLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SOME OF ITS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS.

I. PROFESSOR RYLE AND THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

1. THERE has just come to hand a treatise on "The Canon of the Old Testament," by Herbert E. Ryle of Cambridge, England, which deserves attention.

Driver has dated for us, as best he could, the books and parts of books of the Old Testament. He has given us an analysis of each chapter, told its purpose, and, when known, its author. Other books that are elsewhere reviewed in these pages have traced for us the civil and religious history of the Hebrew people, and expounded the content of Old Testament theology. The book at present under discussion aims to tell when the particular books of the Old Testament began to be regarded as divinely inspired and authoritative. It has, no doubt, often occurred to the inquiring mind as somewhat strange that Hebrew literature should come down to us as Bible, as Holy Scripture, while Greek, Latin, and other literatures can at best claim to be nothing other than classical. The usual explanations of this strange fact do not explain. They assume the existence of an inspired Hebrew Bible, and then, with great learning, proceed to show that our Old Testament is such Hebrew Bible. Ryle's method is very different.

He proceeds on the basis of history, and he believes that Driver's "Introduction" and the Britannica article, "Israel," are a fair statement of the conclusions warranted by the facts at our command. Ryle is no rationalist. I have every reason to believe that he is more orthodox than many who will read what I here write of him. But he is not a man whose orthodoxy blinds him to the facts that are every day coming to light to assist in a fairer, more humane, more rational understanding of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. Ryle believes in God, in Christ, in the Holy Spirit, in all the affirmations of the Church; but still he believes that to fight the tendencies of an age is to make an age work at cross-purpose, it is merely to delay the inevitable. As has been well said by a recent writer on the plays of Sophocles, regarding those who try to stem the tide, "They are the contemporaries of their ancestors or of posterity." Here are Ryle's own words: "The Church is demanding a courageous restatement of those facts upon which modern historical criticism has thrown new light. If, in the attempt to meet this demand, the Christian scholarship of the present generation should err through rashness, love of change, or inaccuracy of observation, the Christian scholarship of another generation will repair the error. Progress towards the truth must be made. But it will not be made without many a stumble." This is certainly a statement showing great fairness and breadth, and to the old dogmatists it would be a sign that those who thus confess feel the weakness of their positions. But to a scholar it is a sign of their greatness. It is a sign that the advocates of the critical and historical methods

of Bible interpretation are neither narrow, bigoted, nor destructive.

2. As is well known, the Hebrew Bible is divided into three parts, *Law*, *Prophets*, and *Writings;* and Ryle argues, against the older scholars, that this threefold division marks three clearly defined stages in the process that finally gave us the sacred Scriptures. The *Law* includes the so-called five books of Moses. The *Prophets* include what we know as histories and prophets. The histories are called "former prophets;" they are Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. The "latter prophets" are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets. The *Writings* constitute the remainder of the Old Testament. It is a noteworthy fact that the Psalms and Job belong here. But still more striking, perhaps, is the fact that Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles do not appear with the other histories, and that Daniel is in this list and not one of the prophets. What do these facts mean? According to Ryle they mean this, that the *Law* was canonized in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, 444 B.C.; the *Prophets* a short time prior to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, say 200 B.C.; and the *Writings* not until shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, 71 A.D.

At the first blush these seem to be startling revelations. But a careful consideration of the evidence, both external and internal, confirms the substantial accuracy of these conclusions. It must, of course, be borne in mind that the date of the composition of a book is quite a different thing from its acceptance into a sacred collection. Many of the Old Testament books were "the ordinary literature of a believing people" for

a considerable period previous to their being generally accepted as having divine sanction. Indeed, it is doubtful whether "Sacred" or "Holy" meant more to the early Jews than we mean by "Classical." At any rate, a "theory of inspiration" is a comparatively late growth.

3. It is, of course, a mistake to suppose that the canonization of Scripture was a sudden affair. Even the Law was not ratified suddenly in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ezra had gradually led the people up to the final act, and even then the law they accepted was largely composed of codes that had long been considered authoritative. So, too, the songs and histories and prophecies incorporated into the Pentateuch were many of them very old. Some of these were undoubtedly folk-songs and folk-tales that had come down from the earliest times. Books that were popular in the eighth century B.C. have been lost. Yet we seem to have the substance of them preserved for us. Num. xxi. 14 quotes the Book of the Wars of Jahveh, and Josh. x. 13 quotes the Book of Jashar. Now we know that the Book of Jashar contained an account of events as late as the days of Solomon. The text of 1 Kings viii. 53[1] is not clear, but the reader may consult 2 Sam. i. 18 for substantial confirmation of the above. These old song-books could be repeated *verbatim* by the people. They were religious and patriotic; to be sure, they had no divine authority, yet they were reverenced and loved. No one ever thought of doubting their truthfulness. Some of the songs, too, came down from the times of Moses and the Judges, and idealized a forgotten age.

[1] The LXX. quotes "Jashar," though שִׁיר was read instead of יָשָׁר

There were also codes of laws that were very old. Perhaps the oldest was that of the ten words, though it must have read very differently from our Ten Commandments. It has been supposed that originally all the prohibitions assumed the form "do not kill," "do not steal," etc. At any rate, the Ten Commandments as we have them in Exodus xx. are of more recent date than the laws immediately following (Ex. xxi.–xxiii.). A careful reading of these laws at once discloses the fact that they belong to a people that possessed very meagre literary abilities, and were but just emerging from a pastoral to an agricultural mode of life.

4. The next code of laws of importance was that of Deut. v.–xxvi. Here we have repeated most of the laws of Ex. xxi.–xxiii., with additions. There is here a law for the king, and the agricultural life is now firmly established. The moral tone of the laws is much more lofty, and they are set forth in less crude form. As we know, this code was ratified in the days of Josiah as the law of the land. It was not accepted as Holy Scripture, but as a state constitution; it was adopted as the law of the land. This, I believe, is the first approach towards canonization that we have any account of in the Old Testament. Whether the earlier book of the covenant, Ex. xxi.–xxiii., was ever accepted in any such formal way is, I think, doubtful. A still later code of laws, and one that is manifestly an improvement upon any former redaction, is the so-called Law of Holiness found in Lev. xvii.–xxvi. The opinion is rapidly gaining ground that this code was drawn up in the days of Ezekiel. But it seems to have made no very great impression until it was published as part of the com-

pleted Torah in the time of Ezra. The absence of any mention of the *law of Moses*, or of an accepted body of law (Torah), previous to the days of Ezra, leads Ryle to the conclusion that the Pentateuch was first made Holy Scripture in the days of Ezra.

5. The *Prophets*, the second third of the Hebrew Bible, and defined at the beginning of this chapter, were all or nearly all in existence at this time, but they were not regarded as having divine authority. There is a tradition that Nehemiah completed the canon; this Ryle overthrows in a very conclusive *excursus* at the close of his volume. It is, however, probable that Nehemiah was influential in lifting certain books, that later were canonized as *Prophets*, to the rank of authoritative interpretations of the *Law*. A history like Judges or Kings illustrates and confirms the laws of Deuteronomy. And the prophets proper were surely recognized as able expounders of the law of Jahveh. In their own days the prophets were often regarded as enthusiasts. They were too far in advance of the masses to meet with much favor. But as the years rolled by, and the people advanced in morals and intellectual perception, they began to see that the law was, after all, a compromise. It was civil rather than ideal. It aimed at what might be rather than what ought to be. So it gradually came to be believed that while the priest was the temporal (civil) interpreter of the law, the prophet was its eternal and inspired vindicator. Not suddenly did this idea come to prevail. No doubt it was opposed and hindered in many circles. But the Book of Ecclesiasticus, chapters xlix.–l. (180 B.C.), speaks of the prophets in such a way as to lead to the conclusion that in the

year 200 B.C. the Hebrew Holy Scriptures consisted of the Law and the Prophets.

6. The name given by the Hebrews themselves to the last division of their Bible is very significant. It is the simple title, *Writings.* Now, evidently at the time this title was given, the books that went under this name were not regarded as especially holy. We get the picture exactly from the title of the Hebrew Bible that has come down to us. In the year 200 B.C. the Hebrew literature consists of a *law*, divinely inspired and purporting to come from Moses, of *prophets*, likewise inspired, consisting of four histories and fifteen prophets, and *writings*. Of these writings nothing is said. Their divine authority is neither affirmed nor denied. Tacitly, indeed, their inspiration is denied. They are just writings. At the time the New Testament was written they had nearly all been accepted as canonical, but they kept the old name. As a consequence the New Testament speaks of the sacred writings of the Jews as *Scriptures*. The terms *Law* and *Prophets* were also often used in later times to designate the whole Old Testament.

We know that some Psalms are Maccabean; we know that Daniel must come from the days of Antiochus. Esther and Ecclesiastes are undoubtedly very late. With all this agrees their place in the canon. The fact that Daniel does not occur among the prophets is sufficiently explained, if Daniel was not written at the time the prophets were canonized. Chronicles ought to appear with Samuel and Kings, but Chronicles was scarcely written at the time the list of Prophets was closed. The fact that the third canon is composed of

a different class of writings from the others will no longer suffice. It is far from true to the facts, and a better explanation of the threefold division has been found. I have only space to suggest that Ryle's reasons for saying that the third canon was not fully recognized until after the destruction of Jerusalem, seem to me to be conclusive. In New Testament times, and to New Testament writers, there was certainly much diversity of opinion.

II. THE LIBERAL PREACHER AND THE HIGHER-CRITICISM.

1. There is a tendency on the part of some to personify the higher criticism, and make it synonymous with negativism and atheism. Such methods are not complimentary to those who use them. Immature personification has led to untold evil in all branches of learning. The heathen personified their gods and let this pass for a definition of them. The scholastics personified human faculties, virtues, and vices, and carried their evil methods to such extremes that Lord Bacon could speak literally of them as *idols;* "idols of the market-place, and the theatre." Idols of the sort here referred to are the results of shiftless mental processes, or they are the creations of the child-intellect. The dog, it is said, interprets all movement zoömorphically. The savage, from imperfect knowledge, personifies all natural forces. He knows no movement apart from his own finite life. And so he explains all motion anthropomorphically. This leads the primitive man into countless errors. It wholly unfits him to be a witness to the truth. I can explain

in no other way certain ideas of my contemporaries. Because they have not taken the trouble to inform themselves, they can do nothing but call names. To them the higher criticism is either a "thing," or it is a "person." Sometimes it is a thing, a tool, used by the intentionally vicious to destroy truth and virtue. To employ a figure of the Autocrat, "sin has many tools for smashing up the Bible, but the higher criticism is the handle which fits them all." More often, however, in extreme Orthodox papers that have recently come to my notice, the higher criticism has assumed the *rôle* of a person, a morally responsible being. The higher criticism is spoken of as doing certain things, as leading the Church astray, as attacking now this, now that, "impregnable" rock of Scripture, which Scripture, to judge by the wailing, does not wholly establish its impregnability. But the higher criticism, to these primitive types of the Bible student, is morally responsible. It is to be reserved for punishment. It is doomed. Smoke and ashes will alone remain at the last.

This personification, to which I have referred, is not mere rhetoric; it is not rhetoric at all. Capricious coincidence alone gives it that appearance. This being so, it is a mistake to interpret these statements as rhetoric. They are of a piece with other idolatries. Aside from the moral and religious content, the mental processes by which they are reached are the same.

2. The higher criticism of the Bible is merely the employment of scientific methods in Biblical study. Those methods of research which have given us the locomotive, the telegraph, and the electric car, are being used also in the study of the Bible. If we

knew how many useless things Tom Edison does and thinks, every day of his life, we would be amazed. Not one in a thousand of his schemes — I'm mostly guessing — ever comes to anything. Some of them are laughable in the extreme to himself as he recalls them. In science these myriads of guesses and blunders and errors never come to light, or, at least, only occasionally. The fittest survive, the others are forgotten. Where, however, trial is necessary, there are cases of misplaced genius, and that without number. Where one useful thing is patented many useless ones are. Is it worth while to personify Invention, and say all manner of evil of it, because more useless tools are patented than good ones? Not by any means; because, in the aggregate, we see unmistakable signs of progress. To one who is half-informed the cases are almost completely parallel. One cannot follow the history of Biblical study for the last one hundred years without being thoroughly convinced of this. A Biblical theory gets out of date now as quick as a bicycle or an electric car. Is this a sign of progress in the one, and of illusion in the other? By no means. Despite aberrations here and there, it has been steady advance from the first application of rational methods to the study of the Scriptures.

In one especial particular it may occur to the reader that progress in mechanical inventions and in Biblical science are not parallel to the degree above specified. It may be said that the one deals with facts, and the other with theories and hypotheses. This is not so to the degree that many suppose. Much of our modern progress in science rests upon assumptions that are

wholly unproved. Further, to the student of history, of language and philosophy, it at once appears that the higher criticism is based upon facts. Professor Green of Princeton and Professor Bissell of Hartford are as much higher critics as are their opponents. They differ in that they draw different conclusions from the facts. As has often enough been said, it is ignorance of obvious facts that must alone account for the prevailing traditional views of the Bible. I say this in spite of the two scholars I have named. Why? Because a rapidly increasing number of men who possess the facts these men possess have forsaken their dogmatic positions, and unprejudiced men have invariably done so.

4. Rev. R. Heber Newton, the Broad Church Episcopalian, says, that in the Bible "is contained God's true word." But he also argues that it is wrong "to accept its utterances indiscriminately," "to consult it as a heathen oracle," "to treat it as authority save in matters of religion;" it is wrong to disregard its chronology in constructing its theology. On the positive side the author grows eloquent. The Bible is our moral and spiritual guide and instructor. Its pages teem with inspirations and helps. Those who read it sympathetically, who find its "mystic sense," will be more than rewarded. It never fails to create a sense of sin and a passion for the ideal. "Read it daily," says Dr. Newton; "read it in the choicest moments of the day."

In the same vein is that apt word of Rev. Newman Smyth's, "the faults of the Old Testament are, as Herder said, the faults of the pupil, and not of the teacher. They are the necessary incidents of a course of moral

education. . . . The same law of evolution seems to have been followed alike in nature and in the Bible."

5. These men are both Christian preachers, and neither is a rationalist in any narrow sense of that word.

There is a very prevalent opinion that criticism and rationalism somehow mean about the same thing, and Bible study has been somewhat impeded by this supposed identity. The critics do certainly eliminate some of the Bible miracles. There are those who eliminate them all. But Professor Driver is a supernaturalist. So are Canon Cheyne, Professor Ryle, and Dr. Horton. All these men believe in the Christian religion. They all see visible traces of the hand of God in the Old Testament. They believe in the eternal usefulness of that revelation.

The critics do seek for natural causes, and they find them often where the older scholars did not. But the Christian student knows that when he has explained all that can be explained, he has but begun to probe the mysteries of God. Where does the real miracle lie, is the question. Granting that the prophet Isaiah saved Judah from Israel's fate in the year 711 or 701, where and how did God help him? Was Isaiah told something by God which came to him as a new thought, apart from any intellectual process on his own part — were the very words of his message to his king put into his mouth? Or did the prophet arrive at all this by intellectual processes of his own — processes which were made possible to him by the sincerity of his thought, the purity of his life, and the nearness of his soul to God? I doubt if any one knows fully the ways

of God with His people. I doubt if the best of the prophets could tell us, so we could understand, what inspiration and the power to work miracles are like. Only those who have had similar uplifts can understand. All merely scientific or intellectual efforts to fathom these things must prove more or less disappointing.

As for myself, I have not reached the point where I desire or am able consistently to eliminate the miraculous from the Old Testament or from the New. I do not see that criticism leads to any such result. But on the other hand, to the critic, the whole Bible is one constant miracle. Indeed, I may say that it is the grand object of modern scholarship to take the epithet miraculous from detached and isolated texts and acts here and there, and place it upon the whole as a grand and consistent unit. The whole is a miracle. And by saying this, I necessarily affirm that there are miracles in the parts of which the whole is formed. We may disagree as to the value to our Christianity of isolated events and narratives, just as we disagree as to the elements of strength in a play of Shakespeare's, and yet agree upon the essentials. Upon the divinity, the grandeur, and the uniqueness of the Christian Revelation, the critics are agreed. And by far the larger number of them are supernaturalists and members of evangelical churches.

There is a tendency on the part of the scholars to avoid in their works those phrases of a devotional nature which are so common in the sermon and the prayer-meeting address; for this reason the critics are often accused of irreverence. The charge is, as a rule,

undeserved. The scholar is giving the preacher and the Sunday-school teacher his material; he is not trying to do his work for him. But this is by no means evidence that he has no interest in that work. Indeed, most of the critics are also preachers. We could not easily do without the inspiring and truly helpful sermons of Driver, Cheyne, and Schleiermacher.

That rationalism which denies the possibility of all miracles, or even goes so far as to deny the historical accuracy of all accounts in our Bible that describe the supernatural, finds little or no favor with the majority of the higher critics, either in this country or in Europe. The whole trend of criticism is away from the German rationalism of the last generation. And the trend of criticism is just as surely away from the crude and materialistic conceptions of the miraculous which have dominated the past, and still prevail among religious people, who are not materialists in aught but the things of the immaterial world.

III. PROFESSOR TOY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

1. The great mass of literature on Old Testament subjects is wholly untrustworthy and unscientific. Hebrew history has been completely revolutionized during the last half century. All the old books, therefore, are totally at sea as to their dates, and their theory of the genesis of Israelitish institutions. Some of the older scholars had all the freedom necessary. De Wette and Ewald were not hampered by traditionalism, but in their time the key to the Old Testament had not been found. Neither Stanley's "Lectures on the Jewish Church,"

nor Ewald's great work, can be recommended as a history of Israel. On the other hand, here and there, as character studies, they are unsurpassed. So along the line of commentaries, one cannot recommend, for general reading, those of Lange or Keil and Delitzsch. Their implied "doctrine of sacred Scripture" has led them into too great absurdities of exegesis, and in too many particulars, to render them safe as guides. The chief error of these authorities is that they always find a meaning for a passage, whether the original contains it, or otherwise; and this meaning is obtained often enough in utter disregard of Hebrew syntax and lexicography. The best preparation for a helpful wrestle with Scripture problems is a free and open mind. And I venture the statement here, that freedom in the discussion of Biblical questions can tend in only one direction. And that "direction" is certainly in more or less close accord with what is known as the higher criticism.

2. The book which I use constantly, a book which no Bible student's study table ought to be without, is Prof. C. H. Toy's "History of the Religion of Israel." It is divided into thirty lessons, with questions, index, and copious references. While professing to be only a primer, it is vastly more. The book is so carefully written, so happy in its arrangement, and so easy in style, as to make it interesting alike to young and old. As I have hinted, to me should be without the book. No Sunday-school class should be allowed to graduate till its members have been taken through it once or thrice.

3. Another reason why I recommend the book is the

fact that it is the only one in English, or at least was so until recently, which treats the whole Old Testament from the point of view of recent discoveries. No effort is made to defend the higher criticism, but its results are freely offered to the student. And in some respects these are themselves the best defence of those principles and methods. In any case, a clear idea of the problem is necessary as an introduction to further study; and this problem, while it has many ramifications, is really one problem. If there is but one Isaiah, Pentateuch criticism has been going astray. If the Pentateuch is one and from Moses, many of the reasons, indeed, most of those urged against an early date for Isaiah, chapters xl.–lxvi., fall to the ground. So, too, the criticism of the Psalms means nothing if the ideas of the Priests' Code in the Pentateuch and of the Babylonian Isaiah are already very old, the one to David and the other to Ezra. Evidently, then, a fair notion of the results of the higher criticism as a whole ought to precede any special study of a particular part. Much superficial, and so far immoral, criticism of the Scriptures is due to the fact that the critic fails in this particular.

IV. W. ROBERTSON SMITH AND THE JEWISH BIBLE.

1. "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church" is a delightful series of twelve lectures on Biblical criticism by that recognized master of a rational theology and a clear style, W. Robertson Smith. While avowedly popular, it is so in no ignoble sense, and the book is further furnished with fifty pages of critical notes and a copious index.

The aim of these lectures is to show how the books of the Old Testament originated, how they came to be regarded as authoritative, and at what dates.

2. The author begins by declaring that a more careful and sympathetic study of the Scriptures is in demand. The traditional views have led the Church into gross errors here and there. Systematic theology has pretended to build upon the Bible, but has by no means succeeded in so doing. The Reformation introduced a new life into Biblical interpretation. But it failed to carry out its promises. It set aside the authority of the Church, only to bind itself more tightly with the authority of the Book. Here it erred, but the seeds of religious freedom had been sown. Luther felt himself at liberty to reject certain books of the Old Testament as apocryphal, in spite of the testimony of the Jew and the Christian. This liberty has been further used by others since Luther, until it is now admitted that each individual book (and often each separate part of that book) must stand or fall upon its own merits. This led to a complete revolution in Old Testament study. All the old questions were reopened. Everything was questioned.

3. A re-study of the work and methods of the scribes has revealed the fact that not so much care was taken in the copying of manuscripts as the Church had supposed. Many books had been copied many times ere they were regarded as sacred, and submitted to careful scribes for transcription. Psalm xviii. and 2 Samuel xxii. are the same, yet the Hebrew text contains over seventy variations of more or less importance. These seem to have crept in between the time of the original

writing of the Song, and the time of its canonization in the twofold form in which we have it. This would be some time subsequent to Ezra (444). To be sure, some variations may be of later date, and this is very probable. Isaiah ii. and Micah iv. illustrate the same fact. Reasoning by analogy, then, we are prepared to find the Hebrew text abounding in errors. All this shows the need of great care in the interpretation of difficult passages. We have no right to suppose that the words must mean something. From what has been said, it would seem more in accordance with the facts in our possession to say that the text is corrupt. Many passages in the earlier prophets and in the Psalms are absolutely untranslatable. Either the text must be emended, or the rules of Hebrew grammar and syntax must be discarded. Professor Smith recognizes all these difficulties. He sees the danger of relying upon proof-texts, or of founding a doctrine upon a particular book or chapter. Here and there verses have been interpolated. Perhaps they were written in the margin at first, and were later introduced into the body of the book. In other places objectionable words, terms, or phrases were left out. Just how much of all this has occurred we cannot say, but certainly much more than people generally are aware of.

4. The sources at hand for restoring the Hebrew text are meagre. Unlike the New Testament, the Old, as we know it, goes back to a single recension. Little, then, can be gained by comparing one edition of the Hebrew Bible with another. But before the barbarous destruction of the great body of Hebrew Bibles, there were great differences in the existing copies. At least

this was probably the case. And from one of these different manuscripts the Septuagint, or Greek translation, was made during the years 275 to 100 B.C. The early critics of the Old Testament, being predisposed on *a priori* grounds to accept the Hebrew text as direct from the hand of the writer, gave little heed to the various readings preserved in the Septuagint. In modern times there has been a great change. Scholars have come to see that they have a treasure in the work of the Seventy. Often when the Hebrew is obscure the Greek is not. And, further, it often happens that when the Greek is translated back into Hebrew we get a text very nearly like that of our Bibles, an intelligible text, and one that might easily have given rise to the errors that the received text has perpetuated. Sometimes neither our Hebrew nor the Greek is able to throw light upon a doubtful passage. And all emendations must be merely conjectural. Yet, even here, the way pointed out by the Septuagint has led to other corrections of the text that have been quite generally accepted.

5. Early Hebrew being written without vowels, and without many of the vowel letters which distinguish one word from another, the difficulties in the way of one who would read a given text were enormous. In our Hebrew Bibles "son" and "between" are pronounced the same, but written differently. The one is *ben*, the other *beyn*, that is, it has the vowel letter. But originally both were written *ben* or more properly *bn*. The Septuagint, in scores of passages, clearly shows that its errors, or its superiority to the Hebrew text, are due to a difference of opinion as to whether the vowel letter should or should not be written.

Owing to the fact that the vowels were not written, we have entirely lost the pronunciation of many words. It is well known that there is no such word as Jehovah. What we have here are the consonants of one word and the vowels of another. When the Hebrew reader came to J-h-v-h, he did not pronounce Jehovah, neither did he say Jahveh, but *Adonay*, which is the ordinary word for Lord. J-h-v-h was a name too holy for his profane lips.[1] So, then, what vowels the proper name of the Jewish God contained no one knows. The vowels in our Hebrew Bibles were not put in till about one thousand years after the Hebrew became a dead language. Whether, then, a particular S—t is sit or sat or sate or is it? is often a difficult problem to solve, and the meaning is quite materially affected by our decision. For example, Gen. xlvii. 31 tells us that "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." Heb. xi. 21, referring to the same event, says he was "leaning on the top of his staff." This illustrates the point; for in Hebrew matteh is *staff* and mittah is *bed*, the consonants being the same. In view of these facts, would it not be strange if a scribe were able to read his *Torah* twice alike?

6. Along with the evidences of corruption in the text has appeared testimony that several books, generally supposed to be early, are in reality quite late. If we maintain the integrity of a book, its date must be as late as that of the latest event recorded. Professor Smith has argued ably in favor of distributing

[1] The LXX. translation of Lev. xxiv. 16, by a slight change from the Hebrew, reads, "He who pronounceth the name of the Lord shall be punished with death."

the Pentateuch between the years 850 and 400 B.C. He adduces evidence to favor a late date for the great body of the Psalms. Of these points, and many others of interest, I cannot speak in this brief sketch. It is sufficient to say that in the main the author is trustworthy, and his subject-matter is of such a nature that no pastor, however busy, can afford to remain in ignorance of it.

Neither can the author, with justice, be called a destructive critic. He has done much in this series of lectures to reconstruct Hebrew history. He has done much to aid the student to a clearer comprehension of Jahveh's plan with his chosen people. In the main, they are facts upon which he builds. I can vouch in many cases for this, and in others I can trust him. Whether he has drawn the legitimate conclusions from his facts I leave it to the reader to decide. Our motto should be: First, what are the facts? Second, what do the facts mean?[1]

V. PROFESSOR DRIVER AND OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

1. I am glad to be able to recommend Dr. S. R. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament." It is worthy of commendation without let or hindrance. To be sure, there are those whose prejudices blind their eyes to the facts, and these cry out against it. And they will continue to do so until they learn that pure and undefiled religion is injured, rather than aided, by external authority and moss-

[1] The Old Testament in the Jewish Church may now be had in a new and improved edition.

covered apologetics. Again, on the other hand, the *Expositor* has published a series of articles by Prof. T. K. Cheyne, in which he takes the ground that the author of our "Introduction" has made too many and too great concessions to traditional views. In several places I am fully satisfied that this is so. But I am not alarmed at these things. Any forward step, taken honestly and cautiously, is worthy of all the support we can give it. The intellectual side of religion cannot be ignored. Half-truths, assiduously followed, are better than whole-truths sitting solitary. But I am by no means willing to admit that Dr. Driver's book is a congeries of half-truths, nor does Cheyne's criticism imply this. Except in a few minor points, he commends it, and, indeed, one must do so, whether he can accept the author's positions or not.

2. Passing over the discussion as to the origin and date of the Hexateuch, or first six books of the Old Testament, we come to the Book of Judges. This book consists of a large number of stories and traditions of early date, and all set to a particular text, the two episodes at the end of the book alone excepted. What is this text? It is this: "Obey Jahveh and you will prosper; disobey, and you perish." The movement is "apostasy, subjugation, penitence, and deliverance." Of some of the judges, the author knows almost nothing. He merely names them, and recites his text. There seems to be some evidence that the author went out of his way to get just twelve judges. The book of 1 Kings (vi. 1) gives these forty years each, thus making the period of the judges last four hundred and eighty years. The chronology of the book itself is

four hundred and ten years. There are many striking resemblances to the Book of Joshua; indeed, they are so minute in places as to force the admission that the two books are often parallel, and that the chronology of Judges and Kings is arbitrary.

3. If attention is paid to the main body of the tradition in the Book of Judges, it at once appears that the stories were at first purely secular, wholly devoid of ethical motive, and, further, that they were stories told for their own sakes alone. As we have them, they are worked over and set to the tune of "disobedience, punishment, repentance, peace." Where did the author get this text? It came, says Professor Driver, from the Book of Deuteronomy, as is clearly seen from a comparison with several passages, especially chapter xxviii. The date assigned for Deuteronomy is 622, the eighteenth year of Josiah. 2 Kings xxiii. tells of the discovery of a book which made a profound impression, and was adopted by the people and their ruler as their law. Would a book making such a profound impression as this did, be allowed to get lost? If not, we must have the book somewhere between the lids of our Bible. If now we compare Deuteronomy with the story referred to in Kings, we find that the people began to do exactly those things which Deuteronomy commands. Further, the people confess that they did not know before that Jehovah had commanded these things. Deuteronomy puts several things under a ban that earlier prophets had regarded as perfectly orthodox. Hosea laments the day when they will have to worship without pillars. Deuteronomy says they *shall not have* these pillars. Driver piles up the evi-

dence in favor of his theory. Much more is to be had for the asking. But enough has been said to indicate the argument in outline. These things being so, it remains to conclude that the Book of Judges was written after 622, though older written accounts may have been used.

4. The general run of Bible students have been left to believe that while Isaiah did not write chapters xl.–lxvi. of our Book of Isaiah, he did write chapters i.–xxxix. Professor Driver thinks the time has come when the intelligent Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Episcopalian, etc., should be taught differently, because always in the end truth is more conducive to morality and religion than error.

5. Isaiah xiii. and xiv. 1–23 are not Isaiah's. They represent the Jews as in exile. Social and political conditions wholly alien to Isaiah and his times are implied. Babylon and Media are mentioned by name, and these were scarcely even names to the Jews of Isaiah's time. Had the words come from Isaiah, they must have been wholly without effect upon the people, because they would have been unintelligible. This section, then, "can only be attributed to an author living towards the close of the exile."

6. As to chapters xv. and xvi., Professor Driver does not pronounce positively. He thinks Isaiah may have written them. The majority of modern critics are more inclined to the view that they are older than Isaiah, though perhaps modified by him, or added to his oracles by an editor. Renan, by a brilliant assumption, gives them to Jonah, a prophet of some note who is mentioned in the Book of Kings as an earlier contem-

porary of Amos and Hosea. Chapter xxi. 1–10 is an oracle by itself, without connection with what precedes or follows, and though beginning indefinitely, concludes with a prediction of the fall of Babylon. This did not take place till one hundred and fifty years after Isaiah's death. Neither was Babylon an enemy at this time, for Merodach Baladan had sent friendly greetings to Hezekiah, Isaiah's favorite king. The view that this section is not Isaiah's is rapidly gaining ground, and even so conservative a critic as Franz Delitzsch assigns it to the days of Cyrus.

7. If chapters xxiv.–xxvii. are also denied to Isaiah, he can no longer be called the greatest of the Hebrew prophets; for, as is well known, xxxvi.–xxxix. are historical and are contained almost verbatim in the Book of Kings. Any one acquainted with Hebrew history, and deeply enough interested in it to be able to sympathize with the ideas and ideals of its respective epochs, cannot fail to agree with Professor Driver in saying that these chapters are not Isaiah's. Agreements, verbal and other, with Joel and the later books; changes of emphasis in the statement of the Messianic ideal, that would have been out of place in Isaiah or his age, together with linguistic and other peculiarities, all point to an age more than a century later than that of Hezekiah and his prophet.

8. Evidently, much of what has been said above will fail to carry conviction, because of a lack of familiarity with the main details of the social and political history of the Hebrew people. But it is just this history which is in dispute. And, as the main source of Hebrew history is the Bible, we must date the books and parts of

books of that Bible ere we can write the history. Some of the points in this history are fixed, however. Some of the results of criticism have also won acceptance from a large public. With these as known we must proceed to the unknown. History and criticism must work hand in hand. And the wise student of the Old Testament will read widely in both.

I have chosen to speak of that part of Driver's book where he is most "destructive." Jeremiah and Ezekiel still stand, practically intact, and are snugly fitted into the dates given them by the tradition of the Church. Some of the minor prophets are likewise left unharmed (!) by the higher criticism. I grow to love Amos and Hosea more and more every day. What is good and worthy is never harmed by criticism. The great prophets and sages of the Old Testament stand forth greater, nobler, and in a truer sense inspired, after the higher criticism has purged away the dross. I appeal to those who are prone to sarcasm when they speak of the higher criticism, to give an instance where it has harmed religion, opposed good morals, or weakened the authority of truth. The scalawags will always gather around the liberals. Is it because the liberals have something for them while the others have not? At any rate, David was a liberal and an outlaw, and the scalawags flocked about him. Saul could not do anything with them, but David made men of them at last. It was *not* David's fault that the debtors and libertines flocked to his standard. It *would* have been his fault had he given them nothing to do. It is not good policy to oppose the modern liberal movement in Biblical criticism, nor is it good taste to criticise it from

insufficient data. I fully agree with Isaiah (xxxii. 5–8) when he says the days will come when "the vile person shall be no more called liberal. . . . But the liberal will devise liberal things, and by liberal things shall he stand." Isaiah knew the meaning of these words, for he was a liberal in his day. But truth was on his side, and he won at last.

VI. THE MEN OF THE BIBLE.

1. A good way to master the history or the literature of any people is to read the lives of their great men. It is becoming a quite common thing to study Bible history and literature in this way. Just as soon as we give up the idea that the Bible is a unit, each book teaching the same things, we detect fine shades of meaning in one writer not found in another, or we detect adherence to a very different moral code in the lives of men so wide apart as Gideon, Solomon, and Jeremiah. It is evidently worth our while then to heed differences as well as agreements in the Biblical authors. And, so far as possible, it should be our aim to detect here the gradual unfolding of the moral and religious life, as the people become able to receive and profit by the progressing revelations of God.

When one man writes a history of Israel emphasizing this evolution of the God-consciousness, the reader may say his history is dogmatic. He has set out with the express intention of making Abraham less perfect than Josiah, Hosea less helpful than 2 Isaiah.

The "Men of the Bible" series is out of the reach of the above charge, owing to the fact that the series has many authors who are of different schools. Here

all shades of opinion are represented. To me the books seem to differ widely in merit. Some of them persist in teaching errors of long standing, while tacitly confessing that the facts are against them. Four in the series are strong, up to the times, and positively inspiring to the preacher and the student. These are "Solomon" and "Minor Prophets" by Farrar, "Jeremiah" by Cheyne, and "Isaiah" by Driver. I am surprised at the freedom with which Farrar moves among his materials; surprised at the ease with which he abandons the opinions of his younger days when the facts are presented to his view. This is a rare good quality. Most of us stop thinking too young. It is easier to turn the "barrel" over and begin again, than it is to revise our writings, our lives, and our thoughts in the light of the world's new advances. A young man once confessed to me that he was no longer Orthodox, but that he intended to preach in an Orthodox church, because all his thinking and writing had been along Orthodox lines. More worthy of admiration is the man who has not only the courage but the energy of his convictions.

2. The books in this series are lives of the men whose names they bear. And a striking confirmation of what I have said above comes to me from the life of Jeremiah as told by Jeremiah's book (if read chronologically, otherwise one might as well read a dictionary) or by the life of that prophet by Cheyne, which is under review. Jeremiah changed his opinions very materially in the middle of his ministry. His early views of divine inspiration and of divine judgment were crude and harsh. And he almost "accused God

to his face," when he came to the point where he must decide, once for all, whether he would live and die in the old views, or move on to better and nobler ones. Jeremiah's was a deep, tender, sympathetic nature, and his struggle was a hard one, but the best conquered. And we owe it to this victory that Jeremiah is reckoned among the greatest of the world's prophets. The story of Jeremiah's life is as interesting as that of Goethe's or Carlyle's. Isaiah's life is as thrilling as is that of Webster or Phillips. Solomon's as broad and grand as that of a Cæsar, a Louis, or a Henry. And why should not these Bible characters be studied by all as well as those of secular history? Has not each of these great ones of the Hebrews had a powerful influence on the secular history of to-day? What Roman lawgiver speaks more widely or with deeper authority to-day than Moses? What great orator has not been inspired by the Hebrew prophets? What great historian does not owe it, directly or otherwise, to some unknown Hebrew, that he writes history with a noble purpose? We need to appreciate more fully the fact that the Bible characters are first and foremost men, — men who lived intensely human and intensely interesting lives. Along this line I cannot forbear adding a word of the publishers of this series: "To the student and the general reader these volumes will be found alike useful and interesting; and the question may well be asked, why the intelligent reader should not find the lives of the great men of the Bible as useful or as fascinating as the story of those who have won a conspicuous place in the annals of secular history."

3. Professor Toy has been pleading recently for mor

expository preaching. With this plea I fully agree. It is largely the preacher's place, and especially must it be the work of the liberal minister, to interest the public more deeply in the moral, secular, and literary sides of the lives of the great Hebrew authors and statesmen. I incline to think that, on the whole, the story of the life of a righteous man is a more powerful sermon on righteousness than one which would commonly go by that name. I believe in the biographical sermon. And especially is this the better way to preach Old Testament religion. Cheyne's "Jeremiah, his Life and Times," is "a course of sermons" preached in Rochester Cathedral. Apparently he finds the plan successful, for this was his second course of a somewhat extended nature and of a biographical character. I have had occasion to say recently to one of our divinity students: Do not go too exclusively to sermons for your inspirations and your models, but go to books. Read widely among the freshest and best books, and let the sermons teach the lessons of books. A sermon boiled down from a book is concise, intense, powerful. A sermon built up from another sermon or sermons is too often weak and ineffectual. For thought loses in the transmission. I speak now only of the "booky" side of the sermon, for always the best sermons come primarily from the preacher's own life and work. Yet these sources are not wholly disseparate, for a man's chosen books are also along the line of his work and his deepest soul experiences.

VII. J. F. GENUNG AND THE BOOK OF JOB.

1. There are several good books on Job. One of the best and most recent is entitled "The Epic of the Inner Life," by John F. Genung.

The introductory study consists of four essays, and this is followed by a new translation and notes. And in every part the work is neatly and ably performed. The Book of Job possesses more than a religious interest. It is one of the great books of the world. The most careful literary critics have long been wont to pronounce it such. It deals with a question that is not narrow nor provincial, but deep and broad as human nature itself. Neither is the technique of the book in any way of such a nature as to limit it to a single people or a single age. It is a cause of serious trouble to the critic, that in the book there is almost no allusion to Hebrew life and history. But it is this very omission on the part of the author that has helped to lift his book above the temporal and transient.

I said the Book of Job dealt with a problem of universal interest and in a manner that accords with the most lofty literary ideals. Yet, strangely enough, till Mr. Genung wrote of Job, no one had thought of combining these two facts as a basis for the interpretation of the book. A glance at some of the interpretations given will show how widely scholars disagree. J. A. Froude says, "It teaches many lessons, but not any one prominent above another;" Professor Conant, "the mysteries of God's providential government of men." Franz Delitzsch thought it answered the

"Why does suffering on suffering befall the righteous?" Others say the theme is, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" None of these answers suffice. As an argument the Book of Job is weak. Indeed, by what reason do we affirm that it was intended for an argument? The speakers often ignore each other, and more often they wander wide of the mark. Many of Job's speeches ignore the friends altogether. Indeed, Genung makes Job say that his are "a despairing man's words to the wind," p. 169. He does not profess to stand by his words in case he is freed from his pains. As an answer to the problem of human suffering, the Book of Job is unsatisfactory indeed. Elihu does not solve the question; God speaking from the whirlwind does not solve it. Any one who goes to Job for a logical solution — a solution that will satisfy the pure reason — of the problem of evil, will be doomed to disappointment. Indeed, I remember to have read, while in college, a review article in which the author argued that all this was intentional. God inspired the Book of Job, purposely making the solution incomplete, because no other solution was possible till Christ came. The question left unanswered in Job is answered in Christ. The last statement is perhaps true enough, but did the author of Job write with any such *dénouement* in mind?

The facts in the case are these: Job's three friends represented the orthodoxy of the day. This was to the effect that the good prosper and the wicked suffer, and conversely. Job's is an experience that will not fit the rule; hence the dialogue. Evidently, unless Job is a historic character, the author has *assumed* the whole

solution from the beginning. Much may be said on either side of the question as to whether Job is an historical personage. Ezekiel mentions a Job that seems to coincide with ours. On the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that the prologue in heaven, and the finished speeches of Job and his friends, all happened as narrated. Further, I think nothing would be gained for ethics and religion in any case. These things do not rest upon an authority that is external.

2. So then, according to Mr. Genung, the aim of the author of Job is not to *prove*, but to *show*. The Hebrews were not theoretical, but practical. A proof of the existence of a just and merciful God they would not have cared for. But a story in which God is represented as creating the world would have had a wide influence. The critics think they find evidence that the story of Elijah is legendary. But to the later Jews the story was an unanswerable argument in favor of a resurrection. Did then some one invent it to deceive? No. The child-race, like the child, is often unable to distinguish between what it has sensed and what it has thought. My two-year-old boy, the other day, called his mother to the window to see a dead squirrel lying on the grass in the rain. He felt much grieved because his mother would not go out and get the "poor dead squirrel." There was no squirrel there. Was the child lying? I think not. He *was* able to imagine, *not* able to distinguish between fact and fancy. "Imagination rules the world." All early peoples argue by means of the story. They tell a story that will account for the facts, and this in time passes into a doctrine.

3. Genung believes, and I think with reason, that it

is Job himself, and not the Book of Job, that solves the problem of evil. The dialogue is subsidiary. The friends are introduced as a background for the picture. "Under these discourses we are to trace, not the building of a system, but the progress of a character, tried, developed, victorious." Again Genung says, "Job's life, as it is traced in the glowing, indignant, faith-inspired words of his complaint, is the triumphant answer. Job *does* fear God for nought." Not by his reason, but by his life, Job *has* answered the question: he has suffered, being virtuous, and has continued in his integrity. He did serve God, and that because it was right to do so, not because God rewarded him for the service.

4. As to the date of Job, Genung seems to me to place the book too early by three hundred years. Job must evidently take its place along side the more metaphysical of the Psalms; and Cheyne, in his Bampton Lectures for 1889, has left us in little doubt as to where these belong. Further, the Satan of Job coincides with this period, and there are other reasons for saying that the Book of Job was composed not far from 400 B.C.

So, too, our author inclines strongly towards the integrity of the book. Undoubtedly the book is in many ways stronger for containing chapter xxviii., on "wisdom," and the closely reasoned speech of Elihu in chapters xxxii.–xxxvii.

5. As to the character of the composition, Genung, as his title suggests, calls Job an epic. Others, with much show of reason, call it a drama. It certainly contains elements of both.

Genung's translation of Job is worthy of highest

praise. He has revivified old expressions, and added many new and happy ones. Throughout the style is noble and strong. There is a graceful *abandon* to the modern spirit. The worn-out talk of the creeds nowhere appears. Here is a strong couplet on page 158:

> "For evil goeth not forth from the dust,
> Nor is it from the ground that trouble springeth."

Another often-quoted passage appears in,

> "Kindness from his friend is due to the despairing,
> Who is losing hold of the fear of the Almighty."

The last verse of chapter ix. is well rendered by the words:

> "For as I am now I am not myself."

A moment spent in comparing this translation with that of our Bibles will convince the reader of the superiority of the former. As Genung suggests, our Bible is like a composite photograph, all striking individualities are obliterated. Job and Kings, Psalms and Jeremiah, read much alike. We lose quite as much as we gain by having *many* translators. Genung has preserved individualities.

The Hebrew text has been carefully followed, too carefully in places, it seems to me. Where the text is manifestly corrupt, and all helps fail, a happy guess is less liable to perpetuate error than is a meek submission to a text that violates Hebrew taste and Hebrew grammar. On page 161 occurs a passage that illustrates the point:—

> "So from the sword, from their mouth,
> And from the hand of the strong, — he rescueth the needy."

The reader cannot but experience a jar when he comes to this couplet. The "from their mouth" does not fit, it does not make sense. Something is the matter. From the analogy of the following line we may correct with comparative assurance. Following the suggestion of Professor Toy, the verse will read:—

> "So from the sword of the oppressor,
> And from the hand of the strong, he rescueth the needy."

The notes appended to the translation are just enough to delight the busy. They elucidate the meaning, and explain forgotten customs. They let the author of Job do most of the talking, which is an elegant idea. And the book will, I predict, do much to extend, in the circles of the rich and the learned, the influence of the marvellous Hebrew Epic.

VIII. RENAN: HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK.

1. "The two greatest intellectual forces in France at this moment," says some one, "are M. Renan and M. Taine." [1] And the author of a careful study of Renan in a recent number of the *Quarterly Review* continues: "Probably that is so: certainly of these two eminent writers, M. Renan is just now incomparably the more influential." As for myself, I like Renan. I am by no means able to estimate him, and give him his place among his contemporaries. I do know, however, that many able preachers are stimulated by Renan.

Some of these follow him closely, others read him just as carefully for his inimitable style, and his mas-

[1] Renan and Taine have both died since this was written.

tery of modern culture, and his inerrancy in the interpretation of certain phases of the "Zeitgeist." Renan is not a superficial scholar, as some have supposed. He has done some of the most careful and laborious work in the interpretation of Semitic inscriptions, life, and religion. His "Life of Jesus" is ideal, yes, far enough from the truth in many ways, no doubt. Yet I question whether Renan has not approached nearer to the real Jesus than Strauss or Geikie. Certainly much of Renan's exegesis agrees with "Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity" against traditional views. Renan has been called "the theological dude." The epithet is a happy one. There are perhaps two reasons why it should fit Renan. His ancestry and his religious experience have both contributed to make him what he is. I believe he himself says that there are two Renans; one is a scholar, the other a poet; one is a sceptic, the other is an ardent spiritualist; one is a Breton, the other a Gascon. Renan is a man of letters, and one of the greatest, but he is primarily a philologist and a theologian. When scholar and poet meet in a Cousin, a Caird, or a Schopenhauer, no one is amazed. But when these meet in a theologian, because the union is more rare, the critics will be more adverse. But it is not Renan's literary style that makes him most liable to the title "dude." At any rate, it would seem that his religious experience must here be taken into account. Renan was intended for the Church, and his early ideas were orthodox enough. But his mind was too broad for the creed that was given him. He outgrew the Christianity that France offered him. And it is a hard matter to grow liberal without losing one's equilibrium. The

majority, perhaps, take refuge in absolute denial or in ecclesiastical symbolism. Renan was too much of a man to adopt either of these alternatives. A sincere priest he could not be; yet he loved religion the more now that he had ceased to view the world with the eyes of religion, and began to view religion with the eyes of the world. "He parted with all that his heart loved, and turned his face towards a strange land. He went with the doubt whether he should have bread to eat or raiment to put on." He himself says, "*Mon cœur a besoin du Christianisme; l'Évangile sera toujours ma morale, l'Église a fait mon Éducation, je l'aime.*" And the world *loves* a man who talks like that. It is no wonder that the "Life of Jesus" "took the world by storm." Here is a heart that has bled for every word of it. And the great, sad world knows the heart that sympathizes with it. We must not be misled by what at times seems a flippant and joking mood in our author. It was this very *gaîeté* in him that saved him to the world. Can't we believe that he has wrestled seriously with his doubts unless he whine? May we not take him at his word when he says, "I am double, sometimes one part of me laughs while the other weeps. That is the explanation of my *gaîeté*"? I can pardon Renan when he says harsh things of my favorites as readily as I pardon others for dragging me mercilessly over scraps of litany and prayer-book to the fresher treasures of their thought. Neither do I fear his scepticism. Indeed, he strengthens my faith, just as a reading of Schopenhauer confirms my optimism. Renan's *gaîeté* overdoes the thing, and this always brings the weight of him around to the positive side.

He regards the world as an "immense practical joke," he tells us as much, and that in his scepticism he finds the happiness of his life. The life of the "theological dude" was above reproach. His doubts are not the outgrowth of animal passions or epicurean tastes. The late Professor Elmslie, in an excellent sermon on the Seventy-third Psalm, says: "It does seem just possible that the good Christian Church we belong to in our time is not in quite the right way of thinking about religious doubt. I am not talking about the doubt of the head, the intellectual and the schools-intellectual fencing, that sort of triviality; let it alone, it is not worth taking notice of. But the real doubt of any age, the doubt of any man's heart and head — what are we to think of that? Are we to stamp it as devilish? Are we to denounce it and excommunicate it? Why, we might be fighting against God. If I read my Bible aright, real, genuine, patient struggle for faith means just the birth-throes of God's revelation of himself in men's hearts." Renan is emphatically the child of his age. His power lies in his ability to "reveal in people's minds ideas or sentiments which are tending to the birth." I believe he is in the birth-throes of God's new revelation. The mediæval creeds we have outgrown, but the *feelings* which were wedded to them are more tenacious. "Though feeling is before thought;" yet "thought is for feeling," and the feelings *for* which our modern thoughts exist are yet to be born in us. The poet and the prophet of this new poetry and new religion are, perhaps, not very far away. To my notion, Renan has saved most that is good in Christianity and Judaism. He has done

much to unite ethics and religion "in the beauty of holiness." If he has been rash at times, if he has made too little of his opportunities to enlarge and fortify the borders of theism and morality, if he has thrown away too much of the Bible because it was supernatural, it is because he was carried away with the deeper poetry of the Old Testament, the deeper piety of the New. In the reaction against supernaturalism several of the greatest of modern scholars have seemingly gone too far. And it is they who must answer for the absurdities of the spiritualists, theosophists, and Christian scientists. Kant said a sensible thing when he said, "Sensible people willingly admit in theory that miracles are possible; but in the business of life they count upon none."

2. Some of Renan's critics think that the weaknesses of the spirit of the age to which he has yielded will render his work transient. I doubt if this is so. The "Life of Jesus" is a work of art, and deserves a place alongside the best writings of Montaigne and Hugo. But I set out to speak of Renan's "History of the People of Israel." Three volumes are out — there is to be another — the set covering the whole period of Hebrew history from the earliest times till the dawn of Christianity. Here, too, we have a work of art. The author has given to the subject the study of a lifetime. He writes of what he loves, and he writes with the skill of France's greatest man of letters. It is a compliment to Hebrew history to be adorned and interpreted by such a man. Little as may be one's interest in the subject, Renan's History will command the attention of the reader. His comments upon the proph-

ets are especially apt. A chapter in the third volume bears the suggestive title, "First Appearance of Socialism." I quote from the preface the author's word of self-defence: "I have been blamed for having, in the previous volume, drawn too many comparisons between the ancient events, which I am relating, and movements of the present day. It is not my fault, if, in the present volume, I have again been led to offend, in this respect, the susceptibility of rhetoricians. *The history of ancient Judaism is the most striking instance of the opposition of political and social questions.* The thinkers of Israel were the first to revolt against the injustice of the world, to refuse their submission to the inequalities, the abuses, and the privileges, without which there can neither be an army nor a strong society. . . . Here we have a lesson upon which modern nations cannot reflect too much." Renan's "History of the People of Israel" is used as a text-book in a leading American university. As a piece of scholarship it is both brilliant and careful, abounding in striking comparisons between a past that Renan has made living, and a present that the Church has too often made dead.

3. Read Renan! He does not follow the beaten track. He will give the head many a jar, and the heart many a jolt. He will lead you to many places where you did not wish to go. He will constrain you to gaze down many a chasm that you have never before dared approach. At the time it will often appear foolhardy and useless, but afterwards you will thank him for taking the lead into his own hands; thank him for taking you where you had not asked to go. If, instead of

buying the insipid *Bible Histories* that are foisted on the public, "sold only by subscription," the people of the country would buy and read a history like this, how the Bible would grow in public esteem!

IX. PROFESSOR TOY'S JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

1. A book which I prize very highly, and one that gives a guiding sensation on any topic in regard to which I consult it, is Prof. Crawford H. Toy's "Judaism and Christianity." This book is at once an Old and New Testament theology. It is carefully indexed; and there is a full list of the Scripture passages quoted and expounded, together with a second index of subjects discussed. It is thus a book that all Bible students should have at hand for reference.

Professor Toy is widely and favorably known as an Old Testament scholar of the first order. Amidst the mass of his materials he moves with a lofty independence. Yet he is never hasty, never rash. He is the most fair, the most careful, the most deferential of critics. He can be called radical only by those who fail to read the signs of the times. To those who have an eye on the character of the work being done by some of the younger scholars, Professor Toy appears as a conservative. He is firmly set against many new hypotheses that would in the end completely conform the Bible to dogmatic standards, and rob us of all confidence in the integrity of the Hebrew documents and credibility of the Hebrew histories. It is as a positive defender of the true kernel of Hebrew religion that Professor Toy will be known to the future. As a teacher, and I speak as his pupil, he never fails to bring out all that is no-

blest and best, most truly spiritual and most truly moral in the sacred records. He loves the book he teaches, and he inspires his pupils with a kindred affection. But it is all in the clear light of intellect. There is no sentiment, no gush, no use of a personal magnetism with its temporary effects. A word of which he is especially fond, and one that ought to grow in favor with all liberal Christians, is "moral-intellectual." His enthusiasm is for a rational morality. It would not, perhaps, be far out of the way to apply to him the words of Kuenen's translator, P. H. Wicksteed: "Kuenen never threw his personality into the scale. If he established a point, you were as sure of it a year afterward, when he was not there, as you were when you sat before him."

2. The author begins with Judaism, because it is not till then that we have Old Testament religion. Previous to Ezra, there is no attempt at system and doctrine. The prophets stand each upon his own authority. There is no *history* of the Hebrew people that is authoritative. There are several codes of laws, differing more or less widely among themselves, and of varying degrees of authority; but then there is no Old Testament canon. No doubt many books that have been since lost were in existence, were widely read, and were quoted as authorities. With Ezra begins a new order. The first canon is formed, the laws of the first five books of the Old Testament are regarded as divine and authoritative. Jewish religion is now, for the first time, reduced to something like a system. Old Testament theology, then, really begins with Ezra, not before, and continues from this time till the dawn of Christianity.

This method of treating the subject is rapidly coming to be recognized as the true one. Previous to Ezra, we have Isaiah's theology, Jeremiah's theology, and so on, but no authorized body of Jewish theology. By a strange paradox, as soon as the Hebrews began to recognize the new individualism of Ezekiel, the powers of the individual as such ceased. The great names are wiped out, and the indefinite and impersonal Torah comes in as the sole authority. To expound this great body of Hebrew doctrine, and trace its development up to the point of its absorption into Christianity, is the task our author has set himself.

3. "Judaism and Christianity" consists of an introduction and eight carefully written chapters of varying length. The introduction is a sociological study. Religion is recognized as a branch of sociology. It is a product of human thought, wrought out by the race in its conflicts with the world without and the world within. Religion cannot sever itself from the society of which it is a part. It must work in and through society; and is inevitably subject to the same "laws of growth, arrest, retrogression, and decay." If a particular religion cannot reform society, it must perish with it. Also, conversely, if a society lacks the power to conform its religion to its material and intellectual growth, that religion must eventually yield to stagnation and decay. Society must progress harmoniously, or all progress is make-believe. Still, Professor Toy would be the last to accuse any particular society. "It is very doubtful whether the term, 'arrest of growth,' can be used of China in any proper sense."

Religion, as a branch of sociology, depends upon the

organization of the social life for the character and direction of its development. The more complex and the more highly organized a particular society, the greater will be the problem of religion to produce unity in the midst of this diversity. A growing society must have a growing religion. Politics and law, science and philosophy, ethics and æsthetics, all have a marked influence upon religion, as religion on them. It is a mistake to suppose that, for example, religion and morality have always been allies. In many phases of society their development has been largely independent. It is the purpose of sociology, and more especially of religion, viewed from the broader view-point of social science, to unite more and more these various phases of human endeavor. Religion must, at any cost, keep in touch with the intellectual and moral, civil and artistic progress of society. But while thus keeping *en rapport*, it must remember that "the absolute power of any given religion will be in proportion to the purity — that is, the spirituality — of its dogma, and the elevation of its moral ideal."

4. One of the chief elements in the progress of religion and society Professor Toy finds to be the great man. I am glad that he has written as he has upon this subject; for I grow more and more to think that here we have not only the key to history, but the solution, so far as they can be solved, of the divine incarnations, Isaiah, Ezra, Paul, and Jesus. "History proceeds by crises, and a crisis implies a great man." The great man is always the child of his age. He goes to his age for the raw material of his thought. Yet, our author continues, "we may demonstrate the man's relation to

his past, exhibit the circle of ideas in which he grows up, and perceive the connection between his thought and that of his times; but in the last analysis, when we reach the creative moment, it is impossible to give the history of the process. There is a mystery in his mental experiences, in the way in which he seizes on the problem, combines its elements, and reaches his result. . . . It is a mystery that meets us in every department of human life; when we have called it genius, intuition, or inspiration, so far from defining it, we have only labelled it with a name that defies definition."

5. Professor Toy finds that the great mass of the religions of the world are inert. They lack the power to conform themselves to the rapid advances of society. It is probable, then, that in time a few great religions will control the world. The three that are now worthy to be called universal religions are Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and Christianity. The last is decidedly the superior. It contains the good of each of the others, and more. It is the most moral and the most spiritual. Further, Christianity is a life, and life possesses infinite powers of adaptation. Lastly, and not of least importance, Christianity is the religion of the "civilized and civilizing nations of the world." Christianity is the religion of the aggressive, the intellectual, and the virile in our own age.

6. It is on this broad basis that the religion of the Bible is discussed. The method of treatment is throughout historical and exhaustive. Ewald, in his "Biblical Theology," professes to take the good and cast the bad away. He ignores what he regards as low

and unspiritual. For popular use such a treatment has its advantages. All literatures deserve just such sympathetic treatment. But this is not the whole truth. And there are always some who desire to know the whole truth. They believe that to over-estimate the past is to be unjust to the present. Professor Toy attempts to give the whole truth. He traces the development of a particular idea from its beginning to the close of the apostolic age. If there are divergent and contradictory ideas, these too are set forth. Absolute accuracy is not claimed. The question is, rather, what may we reasonably infer from the documents in our possession? It may be well to say, however, that the best defence of the Bible doctrine of God, man, and human society is a faithful, accurate, scientific statement of how the best in the Bible finally triumphed over the worst. All sorts of pernicious doctrines were clamoring for acceptance while the Bible was being written. At times the Bible is itself tainted with these; yet in the end, and in spite of evils advocated by men of influence and intelligence, the good was victorious and Christianity went forth to re-create the world. I repeat, the best defence of Biblical religion is just such a comparative study of the books as Professor Toy has given us. In each later book some new good has triumphed. Something that was earthly and sensual has been shuffled off. There is a slow, sure progress from Moses to Christ. And in the great body of the human race there has been a steady advance from the dawn of Christianity to the present day. Professor Toy believes that Christianity has the power to adapt itself to each and all of society's advances, and thus

continue to be a living power for good in the world. The development that led up to Christ did not stop with early Christianity.

X. CANON CHEYNE AND DEVOUT CRITICISM.

1. It gives me pleasure to have such books as Canon Cheyne's to recommend. And especially am I rejoiced to be able to commend such a book as "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism." Many of Professor Cheyne's books are of so profound a nature that they can be appreciated and enjoyed only by specialists. But he is a man who believes that the specialist is also the best man to popularize his own work, and set it in order for the general reader. There is certainly a measure of truth, at least, in this. The specialist is better able than another to set forth the exact truth, and in its true proportions. Sometimes he will miss the argument or illustration that would be most effective. Often he will have less enthusiastic praise from the people he aims to serve. But in the long run such a man is the safest guide.

In this kind of work Canon Cheyne is no novice. He has written several volumes of sermons, and they have been widely read, and have warranted the conclusions to which the Canon has arrived; viz., that the results of criticism should be presupposed in, and made the dogmatic basis of, modern preaching. By some the sermons will be accounted prosy. And to a certain extent such a criticism is just. Yet there is no lack of imagination. The difficulty, if difficulty it is, is in the kind of imagination. The historical and constructive imagination has not been prevailingly used in the composition

of sermons. Those who paint fine pictures often do it at the expense of the truth. It is often argued that the higher criticism is overfull of assumptions. Let him who so argues acquit his favorite preacher of similar "assumptions" if he can. In his restrained, reason-guided imagination, Canon Cheyne seems to me to imitate the great writers in the literature of which he is so fond. And I believe that this same method of communicating the truths of the gospel is destined to multiply in the future. There are those who love fine words; there are more (and the number is increasing) who love the truth clearly and plainly set forth more than they love fine words.

2. "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism" consists of two parts, "The David Narratives" and "The Book of Psalms." In the first part the author is to be thanked for making accessible to English readers the analysis of the books of Samuel by Kautzsch. Readers of Driver's Introduction will recall the things there said going to show that our books of Samuel, like the Pentateuch, are composite. In Kautzsch's commentary these documents are separated and dated. And it is found that there are nine different authors (or editors) of our Samuel. There are accounts of the life of David coming from the days of Solomon and Rehoboam. There is an account of Samuel and Saul coming from the time of Hosea. There are later additions to the traditions made after the publication of Deuteronomy (622 B.C.). Professor Cheyne appends a considerable list of parallel passages showing which tradition is to be considered the more accurate. The two versions upon the slayer of Goliath[1] are treated at considerable

[1] 1 Sam. xvii. 1; xviii. 4; and 2 Sam. xxi. 19.

length in the discourse on David and Goliath. It is not only asserted that Elhanan, and not David, slew Goliath, but it is made apparent why no other interpretation can be possible. Note the omission of "brother" in 2 Sam. xxi. 19, borrowed in the English from 1 Chron. xx. 5; consider also the date and historical fictions of Chronicles as set forth by Driver. Professor Cheyne frankly admits that the story we have loved from our youth is not true. He then proceeds to treat it as a story, written, as all good stories are, for a noble purpose, and preaches from it as any preacher might do.

There are two discourses on the "Character of David," which are the most careful and trustworthy estimate of Israel's great poet and king of any with which I am acquainted. It is easy to make too much of David. It is perhaps easier to underestimate him. Indeed, the orthodox church has never been able to answer the charges of the sceptic with any degree of satisfaction. As our knowledge of ethics and psychology have increased, it has become more and more apparent that *ethically* and *mentally* the David of Samuel could not be the author of the Psalms. Either the David of Samuel is made *unreal* by supposing that he wrote the Hebrew Hymn Book, or the David of the Psalms is made a monster by supposing him to be the King protrayed in Samuel. The "Aids" is a strong and conclusive answer to a certain kind of religious infidelity that is all too common, even among those who by their appreciation of good literature and "good living" show that they are, after all, far from being irreligious.

The chapter on the inspiration of the Psalms I

regard especially suited to the needs of our own time. We cannot reject the inspiration of the Scriptures, if, by so doing, we are driven to affirm that God accomplished nothing, and taught the world no consistent moral and spiritual lesson by the Hebrew people and literature. We must not reject the doctrine of inspiration, if, along with it, we must discard the thought of God in history. On the other hand, if inspiration means the annihilation of free-will and moral responsibility for the time being, if it means the coming to a man of truth that is wholly (or in part) outside of his human powers of comprehension, we, in so far as we are in touch with modern science, must part company with such doctrines of inspiration. Canon Cheyne in many places uses language that I could not use as expressive of my own opinions. But, on the whole, I am in full sympathy with the trend of his remarks. Especially is it fitting to say that the Psalms are the hymns of the Jewish Church. It is not the individual that speaks through them. The authors are unknown. The gifts and functions which formerly belonged to the priests and prophets are here transferred to the whole Jewish people. We have the Psalms to-day because the Church of the Jews was an *inspired* Church. Cheyne understands inspiration in no narrow sense. He does not limit the true divine afflatus to the Biblical writers. He believes that Dante and Browning are, in a very real sense, inspired. "There are not indeed two inspirations, for there is but one Holy Spirit. But there are many degrees and varieties of inspiration."

3. Several of the more important Psalms are expounded in the light of the broad, free criticism out-

lined above, and any spiritually minded man can see that the Scriptures have gained wonderfully in homiletical suggestion by being so treated. It wounds our religious feeling when we are told for the first time that Psalm cx. is not Davidic and not Messianic, but "joy comes in the morning" when we arise to the thought that "God is in his heaven," though our conception of his *method* of self-revelation was erroneous and unworthy of his character.

XI. PROFESSOR DRIVER AS A PREACHER.

The quotation given below was copied by one of the Boston dailies from the *Presbyterian.* It is too extreme to merit a serious reply, and would not be given here but for the fact that some people seem foreordained to continue to hold these views for some time to come. The passage in question which comes from the church of Professor Briggs (!) is as follows: —

"The higher critics are not troubled with modesty. They do not hesitate to make the most positive assertions. They think that they know all about how the Pentateuch was composed, and who did and who did not write the books of the Bible, and when they were written. They cannot bear to have their positions 'questioned.' Men who hold on to what they call traditionalism are treated as fools, and behind the age, and no scholars. They, as the learned of the age, have said 'the last word,' and their infallibility must not be gainsaid. They denounce the dogmaticians, yet are the most dogmatic of modern teachers. They have their own misgivings about the infallibility of the Scriptures, but none about their own processes. A little more humility upon their part would not be out of place. Pride bringeth a snare, and the great Babylon which they have built is liable to fall at any moment, and cover them with confusion and shame. Resting largely upon conjecture, it lacks an enduring foundation."

Not a statement in the whole paragraph is true. The author shows that he does not know the A B C of what the higher criticism is. Higher criticism is that study of the books of the Bible which aims to find out their date, authorship, and meaning. Professor James Robertson is a higher critic, and is just out with an elaborate defence of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Does he think he has said the last word? Not by any means. He is in many ways a most fair and careful man. The late Professor Elmslie was a higher critic, yet he wrote some of the most beautiful, spiritual, and inspiring essays on the Minor Prophets I ever read. But, poor man, it now appears that he thought he knew it all, when in reality he was believing a lie. To be sure he was a conservative, a good orthodox Congregationalist, I believe, but being a higher critic, he must be classed with the rest of us as proud, arrogant, self-assuming, dictatorial, and unchristian. Away with all this sort of talk! To correct such errors puts one out of sorts. I had it in mind to say of the writer of the quoted paragraph a thing which I will not say, though I will write it down here, that the reader may know what my inner thoughts are. Some people seem to me to *purposely* refrain from reading any books on the subjects about which they write, in order that they may tell the most flagrant untruths without wounding (?) their consciences.

2. How different in tone from the unspiritual, controversial, dogmatic temper of the above discussion, both sides, are "Sermons on the Old Testament," by S. R. Driver. We have here twelve sermons and an essay. And "the volume may be regarded," as the author says,

"as supplementary to my 'Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.'" The sermons are on a variety of subjects, and all illustrate how true is the word of Driver and his school, which says that the Bible loses nothing of its moral and spiritual power at their hands. The first sermon is a study of the oldest creation story found in the second chapter of Genesis. Canon Driver shows how absolutely impossible, and how perfectly puerile, it is to attempt to reconcile this account with modern science. The author of the Biblical story did not aim to teach science. His forte was religion. Furthermore, Professor Driver sees in Gen. ii. nothing inconsistent with the positions of theistic evolution. Their differences are due to their different ages. He believes that Gen. ii. is inspired. He also believes that the evolutionist is right in his views of origins. To make Gen. ii. teach evolution would be impossible, but to fail to see the beauties of the one, or the truths of the other, because of an apparent inconsistency, would be to miss the purpose of both.

The eighth sermon is a study of the first chapter of Genesis. Here, again, the author protests against the efforts of those scholars who try to reconcile this account with the teachings of geology. The story contradicts geology at several points, and geology is doubtless right. A forced reconciliation cannot help the cause of truth. There is too much of this sort of thing done already. It has led scores of otherwise truthful men into habits of equivocation. Why not frankly admit the facts? And then what? Is the record worthless? Not at all. When we compare it with the cosmogonies of its time it is a marvel of correct-

ness, of insight. Its theism is still the admiration of the world. It is when a chapter in the Old Testament is compared with *its own time* and not with our time, that its divinity and its inspiration appear. Because *we* have outgrown a chapter or a command is no proof that that word was never a command of God, direct and explicit.

3. Another proof of the divinity of the Bible is the fact that right in the midst of these teachings, that were for a particular time and place are others that are for all time and for every place. Canon Deliver has not passed over these. He believes that the [illegible] an enduring value for religious devotion. [illegible] that the prophets have set the example of the [illegible] religious reformers which will [illegible] stands. He believes that the [illegible] later books of the Old Testament [illegible] the beginnings of the Jews [illegible] world the best [illegible] the soul. [illegible] mons [illegible] teachings [illegible] They are [illegible] and not [illegible]

These [illegible]

tures, there is not that breach between the older scholarship and the new which some have been pleased to emphasize.

It would be impossible to mention in a single chapter all the good books which help to establish this thesis; indeed, some books that most deserve a place here have appeared since these "rambles" were written; but it is hoped that enough has been said to show that the work of the new school of criticism is based upon facts, and that it aims not to destroy faith, but to rescue a faith that was fast passing away of its own accord, because its growth was hampered and its life smothered. Leisurely rambles through Old Testament subjects with such works as have been named in this chapter, or with such books as W. R. Smith's "Prophets of Israel," G. A. Smith's "Book of Isaiah," R. A. Watson's "Book of Job," or R. F. Horton's "Proverbs" cannot fail to inspire and uplift. If I mistake not the reader who loves his conservatism may rise from the reading of such books as these with the comment, that this new gospel is, after all, only the old gospel permeated through and through with a love that casts out fear.

CHAPTER XIII.

HINTS FOR THE PULPIT AND DEVOTIONAL USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"Much of the attraction is due, of course, to the variety and picturesqueness of the Old Testament, to its lyric elements, to the gallant and heroic in it, and to the warm patriotism in which its religion is so often incarnate. But apart from these, the modern mind is especially drawn to the Old Testament, by its portraiture of character, its ideals of social righteousness, its vision of history as the tribunal of God, its treatment of speculative questions, and its treatment of the prudential aspects of life — neither of which last two is treated by the New Testament in detail. Above all, it is the Old Testament's inimitable portraiture of character upon which our great preachers have combined."

PROF. G. A. SMITH.

"The Bible was written so long ago that its taste is not that of our refined age. It abounds in bad language and bad utterances. There should be a holy book made out of its pages — a book not only for children but for all of us. What a glorious book might be made out of that vast mass of wisdom and beauty!"

DAVID SWING.

CHAPTER XIII.

HINTS FOR THE PULPIT AND DEVOTIONAL USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. It has been said that Schleiermacher alone, of the great preachers, ignored the Old Testament, and it has further been said that his involved and inornate style is partly due to this neglect. Certainly any study of the great preachers of the world should begin, not with Chrysostom or Peter the Hermit, but with the great preachers of the Old Testament, Samuel and Elijah, Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah. Prof. G. A. Smith has published a very interesting list of great preachers who were helped to greatness by the great preachers of the Old Testament, and thus helped because "the foundation of Old Testament preaching is the passion to win men."[1] They were in dead earnest, to them the vital questions of religion and morals were life and death questions. For truth they would sacrifice anything, even their very lives. And to the preacher who will take the trouble to understand the Biblical prophets all this is contagious. It proved its power to uplift and inspire to Chrysostom and Savonarola, to Kingsley, Maurice and Robertson. The Old Testament is the book of liberty. It teaches and inspires freedom alike in church and state. As Professor Smith truly says, the prophets of the Old Testament

[1] Prof. G. A. Smith's Inaugural Address, p. 44.

were citizens and patriots, the apostles of the New were sojourners and pilgrims. It is to be expected, then, that New Testament scholars will warn Old Testament scholars not to move ahead too fast for them.[1] And meanwhile let all alike take encouragement from the fact that the so-called destructive parts of criticism but remove difficulties "which have always been an embarrassment to conscientious preachers." When they remove more than this the Christian conscience will cry out with a voice that will be heard and obeyed. On the other hand, when the Church reaches the point where it can put faith in the Christian critics that it has itself produced, then we may hope to see the Old Testament taking the place which it deserves in our pulpit and devotional readings.

2. One of the boons needed to bring this about is an expurgated Bible, to use a somewhat harsh and unsuitable term. There has long been a silent, or but half expressed, longing for just such a Bible. But the reason this longing has not been more pronounced and importunate has been the fact that people have been taught that the Bible is a unit, all equally inspired and equally valuable. It is because this old way of stating our belief in the Bible is fast becoming a thing of the past, that the expurgated Bible is not only a possibility, but (may we not hope?) an assured fact.[2]

For the general reader some such Scriptures as these should be in great demand. It is worse than useless

[1] W. Sanday's Two Present-Day Questions, p. 31, *passim.*

[2] Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian, published by the Putnams, are not quite free from a traditionalism that enslaves the thought of the original.

for the ordinary Christian to read the Bible through by rote. There are whole sections that are nothing but genealogical tables, without a scrap of incident to enliven their dry bones. There are arguments in the prophets which are good in themselves, but are illustrated by incidents which are, to our age, indelicate and vulgar. There are examples of cruelty and deep-seated revenge in the Old Testament that were never read in the Jewish synagogues, and, so far as I know, are never read to-day in public or private worship. There are long sections in the prophets which are nothing but notes for oral discourses. The student can sometimes fill out these notes, but to the uninitiated they are but a meaningless jumble. In the New Testament there is less that is open to criticism of this character, but even here a careful selection will add to the value of the book rather than take from it. There are portions of the New Testament that are as dry and recondite as an eighteenth century theologian. For devotional purposes they are valueless. The argument follows laws of thought and laws of association that are no longer intelligible or forcible. In passages of this sort the "Expositor's Bible" is more wholesome reading for the ordinary student than the Bible itself. I have had occasion to peep into quite a number of pulpit Bibles during the last few years, and I find, if the lead pencil marks tell what they seem to, that my brother ministers are in the habit of omitting these "hard sayings" in their public readings.

This sort of thing ought to be done. It ought to be done oftener than it is. For we have our Christian doctrine in earthen vessels whose form perishes. The

Greek and Hebrew languages are dead. Even the languages into which the Scriptures were first translated are dead, the Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin. The letter perishes, but the spirit is eternal. We ought to be more free and frank in recognizing this. To bind one's self to a translation and to the original author's own method and manner of statement is to serve the letter rather than the spirit. A glance at Driver's Introduction, or at the historical references in the books themselves, will at once convince the reader that he might about as well attempt to read the dictionary through by rote as a book like our Isaiah or Jeremiah.

3. In the beginning the dignitaries assembled and discussed the Scriptures in existence with a view to the formation of the canon. They were not agreed as to which books were inspired and which were not. There was often hot, even acrimonious, debate. At last it was decided *by vote* that such and such books should be Bible, and other such should not be Bible. By that vote the Church declared what books would be helpful to it, and what books would not be so helpful. If the Church is a living Church, apparently it has a just right at any time to take a vote on this question. Our age has a right — indeed, it is our duty — to declare what parts of the Bible moralize us and spiritualize us, and what parts do not. We do not deny the inspiration of the omitted portions by rejecting them from our present day Bible. We merely declare that Christianity has been a success, and those commands have been left behind. Christianity is a success, not to the extent that it keeps the Bible before it, but to the exact extent that it puts the Bible behind it. It is not the Bible but the ideal of

life described in the Bible, to make a somewhat arbitrary distinction, which we should keep before us as our aim and goal. And to do this we must put in order those parts that bear a message to our age. In the readings suggested below, an effort has been made to do this, and it is hoped that thus the more unfamiliar parts of the Old Testament will be made to speak in a well-known tongue.

4. The readings suggested are based, so far as practicable, upon the results of the best critical scholarship. The list is suggestive rather than complete, and no effort has been made to include the great chapters of the Old Testament which are already often read in public and private.

AMOS, i. 3 – ii. 5; v. 4–8.

AMOS, i. 2; iii. 1–8; v. 11, 12, 14, 18–24, 15.

AMOS, vi. 1; viii. 4–8; ix. 7–9, 11–15.

HOSEA, iv. 1–9; vi. 1–7; xiv. 4–8[a]; xi. 1, 3, 4, 8, 9.

ISAIAH, vi. 1–13; i. 2–20, 25–27.

ISAIAH, v. 8–24; iv. 3–6 (a song of woes).

ISAIAH, vii. 1–25.

ISAIAH, v. 25; ix. 8–x. 4; v. 26–30 (omitting ix. 15, a beautiful poem).

MICAH, i. 2–5[a]; ii. 1–4[a], 11; iii. 4–7, 9–12; iv. 1–4.

2 MICAH, vi. 1; vii. 1–6; vi. 2–8; vii. 18–20.

NAHUM, i. 1; ii. 1–6; iii. 1–3; i. 2–7, 15.

ZEPHANIAH, i. 2, 3, 12–18; iii. 1–5, 8–10, 13–17, 20 (omitting "when I bring" to end).

JEREMIAH, xx. 7–11, 14, 15, 18. (the prophet's lament because his predictions have not come true); xviii. 1–12 (the reason why his words of woe were not fulfilled, see also the reading on Jonah).

JEREMIAH, xxxi. 1–7, 10–14, 28–35 (a beautiful passage with a promise of the new covenant).

2 ISAIAH, xlii. 1–4; l. 4–9; lxix. 1–6 (the suffering servant of Jahveh).

JOEL, ii. 1–14, 28–32; iii. 17–21 (omitting vs. 19).

JONAH, i. 1–8, 11–15, 17[a]; iii. 1–5, 10; iv. 1–11, (omitting 5[b], if he made a booth, why the gourd in vs. 6? This reading is short, yet it includes the whole story and lesson of the book).

One measurably familiar with the Bible, and with a good commentary in hand, could easily follow out the suggestions given above, and compile a connected and helpful reading from the Bible on almost any desired subject. The plan is certainly worthy of a fair trial, if by it our pulpit lessons may be rendered more intelligible to the masses, and more moral and spiritual as helps to divine worship.

CHAPTER XIV.

AN INEXPENSIVE OLD TESTAMENT LIBRARY.

"The deep book, no matter how remote the subject, helps us best."

EMERSON.

"Reade not to contradict, and confute;
Nor to believe and take for granted;
Nor to find talk and discourse;
But to weigh and consider."

BACON.

"Books are not absolutely dead things, but doe contain a potencie of life in them, to be as active as that soule was whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve, as in a viall, the purest efficacie and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. . . . As good almost kill a man, as kill a good booke; who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good booke, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were in the eye."

MILTON.

CHAPTER XIV.

AN INEXPENSIVE OLD TESTAMENT LIBRARY.

1. Of commentaries there are many things to be said. If one already has correct principles of Biblical interpretation, any commentary is better than none. On the other hand, if a man has not some key to the Bible and its true purpose, a poor commentary is worse than none at all. In any case a good one is better than a poor one. The Bible has been greatly and deeply injured by interpreters who have worked in a slip-shod and uncritical manner. This is true, not only of commentators, but of preachers. Many good sermons are founded upon a false interpretation of an important Scripture text. Such blunders as this occur alarmingly often, and there is little or no excuse for them. Good books on Biblical subjects are many and cheap. Furthermore, the Bible can be made an authority for everything that is good, by taking texts in their *real* meaning, by using them without addition or subtraction, without exaggeration or equivocation. If the Church, or any branch of the Church, uses a text in any other than its true meaning, the world will some day find it out to our shame. It is especially necessary that the "progressive" minister be fair and up to date in his exegesis, for the eyes of all are upon him, and, secondly, the evidences of the general truthfulness of his positions are multiplying so rapidly that he does

not need to add to, or take from. He can be fair, he can insist upon our adopting the *natural* meaning of texts, and be sure that the truths that he loves will triumph at last.

The Bible has been injured by preachers who have misinterpreted it; it has been injured by commentators, who have purposely and confessedly ignored important facts bearing upon the interpretation of books and parts of books. I have before me a commentary in two volumes on Exodus, in which the author professes to ignore everything bearing upon the history and the archæology of the period. And, of course, a man who ignores testimony from these sources may formulate any conceivable theory as to the date and authorship of the book. He may, if he ignore history, defend the most plenary form of inspiration without in the least being conscious that he is defending a lie. Suppose one wrote thus of Daniel, how easy it would be to defend this book as historical. But to one who has a smattering of Babylonian history, there are things to be considered that will at least carry us as far as to doubt whether the book is to be accepted as history, to doubt whether it is worth while for a Christian to spend the time to defend its miracles. The book of Daniel mentions a Babylonian captivity in the third year of Jehoiachim. History knows nothing of this. Yet we have a full record of Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns. Daniel mentions a long period of insanity that overtook Nebuchadnezzar. Yet, strangely enough, royal records bearing his name and containing rational words have come down to us from every year of his reign.[1]

[1] Driver (Introduction) thinks, however, that the Book of Daniel may, after all, be right on this point.

Lastly, we know all the Babylonian kings, and there is no Belshazzar among them. These and other discrepancies are altogether too patent to be ignored. Another thing to be considered is the fact that the Book of Daniel gives us an accurate history of a period four hundred years subsequent to the reputed age of Daniel. Similar things may be said of many Old Testament books. They are not always things that would lead us to change our minds as to the moral and religious value of them; but they are things that we need to know, if we would have an intelligent idea of what a book really was intended to teach.

It would seem, therefore, that every minister should have in his library a trustworthy set of Bible commentaries. There is too little recognition of the importance of this. The clergymen of the age, and especially the more progressive ones, are too prone to neglect this class of literature, and go elsewhere for sermon material. I fear this is a mistake. Some of the very best ministers have, as a consequence, fallen into a slovenly exegesis. It is not because they are adverse to the better views, but because the subject is distasteful. They have simply neglected to keep themselves informed.

2. The list of Old Testament commentaries that is added below is not by any means complete. Neither, perhaps, have I always chosen the best to be had; yet so far as I know them, they are good, and some of them, I am sure, are the best. Some Old Testament books are as yet without an English commentary that can be recommended.

GENESIS. Delitzsch, new, 2 vols., good.

GENESIS, EXODUS, LEVITICUS, NUMBERS. M. M. Kalisch, good and expensive.

JOSHUA, JUDGES, RUTH. Keil, fair.

SAMUEL. Kirkpatrick, in Cambridge Bible for Schools, fair.

EZRA, NEHEMIAH. Ryle, Cam. Bible, excellent.

JOB. Davidson, Cam. Bible, excellent.

JOB. Genung, Epic of the Inner Life, excellent.

PSALMS. Cheyne, excellent.

PSALMS. Delitzsch, new, good.

PROVERBS. Delitzsch, fair.

ECCLESIASTES. Plumptre, Cam. Bible, excellent.

ISAIAH. Cheyne, excellent.

ISAIAH. Delitzsch, new, good.

JEREMIAH. Orelli, good.

JEREMIAH. Stearne, Cam. Bible, fair.

EZEKIEL. Davidson, Cam. Bible, excellent.

DANIEL. A. A. Bevan, excellent.

HOSEA. Cheyne, Cam. Bible, fair.

MICAH. Cheyne, Cam. Bible, fair.

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI. Perowne, Cam. Bible, fair.

Other numbers of the Cambridge Bible that will be excellent are Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy by Ginsburg, and Isaiah by Robertson Smith. As to the books omitted from this list it will be best, perhaps, on the whole, to wait for something better than has yet appeared, nor is it probable that we shall have long to wait. By no means buy sets of commentaries straight. There are volumes in the Cambridge Bible and in Ellicott that are not worth the paper they are written on.

3. While it is the office of the commentary to give an introduction to each book treated, it is certainly worth while to own for reference, if not for study, a book like Driver's Introduction, and this should be

supplemented with a copy of Professor Ryle's book on the Canon.

4. Books that systematize the teachings of the Old Testament are very helpful. Much of the Old Testament theology is practical theology, or it is everyday religion. Books that no minister's library should be without are Hermann Schultz's two volumes on this subject. They are a rich mine of learning and spiritual insight. Less expensive and equally scholarly and reverent is Piepenbring's "Old Testament Theology," translated into very readable English by Professor Mitchell of Boston University.

5. Old Testament histories are legion. Renan's is delightful, somewhat out of date in its critical views, and abominably translated. Graetz's first volume is somewhat better. Wellhausen's is, on the whole, the best, while, of the older histories, Stanley's is by no means as yet supplanted.

6. For the busy minister and the general reader, books like the "Expositor's Bible," and the "Men of the Bible" series are especially to be recommended. These books bring the Old Testament writers right down to our own age. The biographical element in them gives them life and inspiration. But both these series have poor volumes in them. G. A. Smith's Isaiah and Cheyne's Jeremiah are samples of the better numbers.

7. By no means should one avoid the latest books. Yet one should be very careful about reading on Old Testament subjects anything that comes to hand. Do not read a book that a friend has recommended unless you know why his opinion should be respected. Many

men, whose intents and desires are right, are full of most untenable ideas, because they have been led astray by men who have thought more of defending a tradition or an hypothesis than of speaking the truth. Much of what is being said about the confirmations from the monuments is utterly baseless. Professor Cheyne is certainly right in laying serious charges at the doors of such writers as A. H. Sayce. They draw perfectly absurd conclusions from the facts. The great Assyriologists are on the side of the modern school. Let those who desire guidance in this direction, read Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," or the new series of the "Records of the Past." These are far better than the conclusions drawn from the inscriptions that are going the rounds of the religious press.

It is certainly true that the Church should move slowly and with caution in these matters. But to the truly religious man, to the man of faith, there is little to cause alarm in these newer books. If ours is an age of unbelief, it is this unbelief that has caused destructive Biblical criticism; the higher criticism has not caused it. For the modern movement in Bible study is at bottom sincere, profoundly in earnest, profoundly moral, and filled with an intense desire to reach the very heart of our modern life. It is an effort, not to take the gospel away from the people, but to bring it to them in all its primitive purity and power.

INDEX.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 174.
Amos, 100, 130.
Apocrypha of the Old Testament, 117.
Atonement: views of the prophets, 133, 147; of the priests, 136; of Paul, 144, 147; of 2 Isaiah, 153; vicarious, 165; day of, 141.
Azazel, 141.

BARUCH, BOOK OF, 107.
Bible, greatness of, 47; need of an expurgated edition of, 310.
Biblical study, 18; obstacles to, 42; revival of, 29; common method reversed, 26.
Biographical sermons, 280.

CAIRD, E., 245.
Caird, J., 233.
Canon of the Old Testament, 251 fol.
Carlyle, 159.
Commerce, 210.
Cheyne, Canon, 278, 298.
Christ as Messiah, 121; as a sacrifice, 149; as suffering for the world, 175, 179.
Chronicles, Book of, 204, 300.
Creation, 52, 277.
Criticism, see Higher Criticism.

DANIEL, BOOK OF, 106, 204, 318.
Deborah's Song, 87.
Deuteronomy, Book of, 129, 144, 158, 255, 273.
Diognetus, epistle to, 149.
Driver, Canon, 58, 271, 278, 302.

ECCLESIASTES, BOOK OF, 56, 134.
Ecclesiasticus, see Sirach.
Education, 211.
Elmslie, Prof., 288.
Enoch, Book of, 111.
Evolution of Religion, 233 fol.
Exodus, Book of, 128, 155, 255.
Expurgated Bible, 310.
Ezekiel, Book of, 55, 64, 103, 136, 255, 276.
Ezra-Nehemiah, Book of, 204.

FAITH, 15, 133.
Fallibility of the Bible, 61, 67.
Family, 208.
Farrar, Canon, 278.
Freedom, 92.

GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO, 143, 145.
Genesis, Book of, 112, 128, 156, 304.
Genung, Prof., 280 fol.
Gideon, 277.
God, history of the idea of, 79, 93.
Gospel, same in the two Testaments, 188.

Government, 209.
Gnostics, 222.
Green, T. H., 234.

HABAKKUK, BOOK OF, 134.
Haeckel, view of Old Testament, 227.
Haggai, Book of, 105, 136.
Happiness, 158.
Hebrew language, 269.
Hegel, view of Old Testament, 224.
Higher criticism, 258 fol., 276, 298, 302.
Higher critics, 16, 31.
Hosea, Book of, 90, 101, 132.

IMMANENCE OF GOD, 74, 75.
Individualism, 55.
Inspiration, 58, 68, 301; in New Testament, 66; verbal, conceptual, plenary, 72.
Inspirationism, 54.
Isaiah, Book of First; 63, 93, 101, 131, 274.
Isaiah, Book of Second, 104, 153 fol., 162, 173, 181.
Israel, limitations of, 38.

JEREMIAH, BOOK OF, 55, 102, 132, 194, 276.
Jesus, the Christ, 104; view of Old Testament, 219.
Jews, orthodox, 217; reformed, 218.
Job, Book of, 56, 134, 280 fol.
Joel, Book of, 106, 136.
John, Gospel of, 179.
Josephus, Flavius, 168.
Joshua, Book of, 154.
Judges, Book of, 204, 272.
Justin Martyr, 168.

KANT, IMMANUEL, VIEW OF OLD TESTAMENT, 223.
Kings, Book of, 154, 204.
Kuenen, Abraham, 83 fol.

LABOR, DIGNITY OF, 210.
Land, ownership of, 209.
Law, Mosaic, abrogated, 146; spiritualized, 164.
Leviticus, Book of, 136, 138, 255.
Lotze, Hermann, view of Old Testament, 225.

MACCABEES, BOOK OF, 107.
Malachi, Book of, 105, 115.
Man, influence of the great, 295.
Marcion, view of Old Testament, 222.
Mark, Gospel of, 115, 174, 176.
Matthew, Gospel of, 177, 219.
Messiah, as king, 101, 110; as priest, 108; as prophet, 109; as Christ, 121; spiritual leadership of, 117.
Messianism, general nature of, 99, 113.
Micah, Book of, 93, 102, 132.
Miracles, 262, 263; Kant on, 290.
Monotheism, 89.
Moses, work of, 82 fol.

NEHEMIAH–EZRA, BOOK OF, 204.
Newton, Rev. R. Heber, 261.
Numbers, Book of, 254.

OLD TESTAMENT, permanent elements in, 28, 46; chronology of, 204; defence of, 30, 297; popularized, 298; commentaries, 319; introductions, 320; histories, 321; theologies, 321.

[illegible]

Samuel, Books of, [illegible]

[illegible]

Wellhausen, [illegible]

Zacharias, [illegible]

3 2044 054 114 038